

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
COMP PLAN DELIBERATIONS
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2003**

City Hall Council Chambers
210 East 13th Street
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the City Hall Council Chambers, 210 East 13th Street, Vancouver, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Present: Vaughn Lein, Chair; Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair; Lonnie Moss, Ron Barca, Carey Smith, Dick Deleissegues and Jada Rupley.

Planning Commission Absent: None.

Staff Present: Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Patrick Lee, Long Range Manager; Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager II; Jose Alvarez, Planner II; Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner; Sandra Towne, Planner III; Colete Anderson, Planner II; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for November 13, 2003

The agenda for November 13, 2003, was approved as distributed.

B. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

UPDATE OF CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

PLEASE NOTE: This hearing will focus on deliberations.

Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Plan. As part of this effort, the Clark County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing to take testimony on, and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding update to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. At this hearing, the following will be considered:

Proposed changes to the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan text and policies contained within.

Proposed Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps for unincorporated rural and resource lands, and maps establishing expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries and providing plan designations for unincorporated lands within such boundaries for each of the following cities in Clark County: Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and Yacolt.

Implementation Measures - Proposed zoning ordinances and other measures necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Capital Facilities Plans and supporting documents.

A Final EIS issued on the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for Clark County and cities within the county.

Staff Contacts: Patrick Lee, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4112 or Bob Higbie, 397-2375, Ext. 4113.

LEE: Yes. Last week we distributed packets pertaining to site-specific requests, I think there was 18 or 19 of them inside urban growth boundaries, you were supposed to consider the information and decide us, advise us how you wish us to proceed with those particular items, if you wish us to proceed through the dockets process or if you do not wish to make a, to further consider these at this time.

LEIN: Are there any particular site-specific issues that members of the Planning Commission want to recommend that staff goes into the docket process or continue on with publication and getting into the public hearing agenda? Ron.

BARCA: Well, I was actually thinking there would be a lot of people interested in discussing this going in. The items that were put forward I guess I'm of the opinion because we don't know where we're really moving towards in the aspect of the subarea planning or master planning aspects of the individual areas, I was kind of hoping that we were going to get those 20 odd parcels notified and brought in. That was kind of how I thought that we were working towards but --

LEIN: I think staff asked us to designate which of these 20 or 22 that we had that we would want to continue on rather than sending them all forward. The other option would be to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that they review these to go on the docket as a docket item.

LEE: Yeah. And there was the further complication that Rich Lowry addressed last week in that we do not have the ability to, it may be difficult to notice and hold public hearings on these and still get to the Board before things can be folded into the comp plan review process based on timing and based on legal restrictions that we only amend once a year, so that kind of points in the direction of going through the dockets process where if you advise us of those that -- on the list that you feel should be pursued further, we take those to the Board and try and establish a hearing most likely in January as opposed to now to get that process underway and in quick order.

LEIN: I think there was a couple on here that we had discussion on. One was 236, the Zeilers, requesting ML to UL. I guess the concern I have it sort of goes against the policy that we're looking at, but as you look at the property involved, that one may make more sense than some of the others.

MOSS: Well, I think that's -- I think I agree, Vaughn. And also I think I made the suggestion at the last hearing that that's one that more appropriately ought to be considered as an urban growth boundary issue since it is right on the boundary itself.

LEE: Yes, you did, and we -- based on consultation with Rich Lowry we agreed that, that in that particular case that may be appropriate because of the relationship of the parcels inside and outside.

LEIN: I think many of the others in my estimation if you look at trying to resolve issues in terms of providing additional jobs, et cetera, many of them were taking urban mediums or the ones that were taking urban mediums to MLs or CGs were not very significant in terms of size, and I think that with that in mind I would question some of these as far as their, the importance they have at this particular time since they're already within the UGA. There's only two I think that have significant acreage of 40 acre parcels, others are down as low as .48 acres, there's a 43. So direction to staff, are there any that we want to forward or have staff look at or forward on to the County Commissioners in terms of the docket items?

BARCA: I'm just a little perplexed on how you make the pinpoint determination when we haven't really got into the aspect of saying what areas make sense in a larger context to grow.

LEE: Ron, if I may interrupt, I'm sorry, are you, we are talking about the individual requests that are already inside existing urban growth areas, we're not talking about the site-specific requests that are along the edge of the existing urban growth areas, some of which are

proposed to come in, some of which are not proposed to come in.

BARCA: And I do understand that. I guess for me it's the thought process as we start to look at the area and how we're going to be talking about changing on the perimeter of the area, but also what affect or net changes we would expect to see from the growth pattern inside. In some cases we are looking at the aspects of throwing commercial land or business park out further from what is an existing area. We have to recognize it as we start to develop more inventory in another location, places that we have already designated inventory perhaps become suspect, surplus, they're not as good of a location, and then that would say to me, then, some of these requests are very valid in that regard.

If we hold the line tight in specific areas, perhaps the idea that a particular piece of property in inventory becomes more viable just because of that particular zone becomes constrained, the inventory becomes constrained to the point that all of a sudden it becomes viable because there's a need there. You know, I don't doubt that this Board could come to a conclusion on each one of these things by themselves in an isolated fashion, I just think that we're in the midst of a broad-base change and I would like to look at these specific parcels within the context of that broad-base change.

LEIN: I guess I'm confused here, Ron, because the parcel that is being reviewed is a small parcel around which land is not changing, we're not going to be changing anything else, this is pretty much parcel-specific.

DELEISSEGUES: And following up to that, I think we ought to look at all 19 of them. You know, a number of these were zoned one way and then for some reason were zoned another way which almost looks inconsistent to the zoning in the surrounding parcels and it wouldn't take long I don't think to look at all 19 of these. We've narrowed it down from almost 300 to these 19.

LEE: And it may not take long to deliberate on any one of these, but we do, it does take some time for us to complete the noticing, to complete the SEPA analysis that would have to go along with this, and then to hold the hearing and notification would include notification to surrounding property owners so that it is unpredictable what level of testimony we might have on any one of these.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, maybe we won't do it tonight but sooner or later we've got to deal with these. I think we ought to deal with these 19 first. Whenever we do it we should start with these and then work toward the others.

TOWNE: Excuse me, Sandra Towne, Clark County. I'd like to just correct, I do have a new spreadsheet and it is 20 so I want to make sure that that's on the record. And that does include the oral testimony, so we've got 20 of them inside the UGA that testified either with written testimony or oral testimony.

DELEISSEGUES: I've only got 19 on my list here so I don't know which one is the 20th one.

TOWNE: Right. You don't have the new list yet, I have them all in front of me right now, that's what I did this week since last week.

BARCA: Sandra, did you just add one or were there some deletions and then some additions?

TOWNE: I think it ends up just adding one.

BARCA: Well, I concur with Dick, I believe within the context of what we're doing we should go through all 20 and if it's not appropriate to do it now because of the time frame, then we need to do it when the time frame is appropriate.

LEIN: Jeff.

WRISTON: Yeah, I guess that's where I fell on this thing and I'm glad to hear you guys say that because I was a little, getting a little confused and I thought that what our task was was to kind of go through here and look and see if any one of them was for lack of a better word such a no brainer that we shouldn't hear it and I didn't find or even see one of those. I mean in going through them I didn't realize, I guess I didn't quite understand that we were going to go through them to decide whether they should be put on the docket, I thought it was to be noticed up to be heard so. But I guess I'm in support of what they're saying anyway. And I did go through them and I didn't see any one and they all seem -- I mean some may have more merit than others, but they all seem like they should be, should be heard. I mean it's kind of hard to determine, I don't think we could, they'd have to be pretty, pretty meritless to just say, okay, we're not even going to hear it but --

MOSS: Well, I think I'm in kind of the same place, I didn't, none of these sprung to mind immediately that told me that they should be eliminated. And I haven't done as thorough a review as I'd like to have, to have done either, but, Jeff, I don't, I don't think your recollection was wrong at the last hearing, we weren't necessarily talking about the docket, we were talking about maybe getting these done beforehand, but it sounds like, Pat, you're saying that it would be very difficult to get these considered in time to be included in the final decision by the Commissioners?

LEE: Yes, I do. I think it would be. We could easily accomplish this, the noticing, the SEPA analysis, et cetera, and have a hearing in January so it's something that we could move on relatively quickly, but I do think that between now and the end of the year it's probably too much of a challenge for us.

LEIN: Comments? Carey.

SMITH: I agree, I think we should take a closer look at these 19. I think just going through them I think they're all legitimate requests that should be addressed.

LEIN: Jada.

RUPLEY: I agree also.

LEIN: I guess there's a consensus. I don't necessarily agree for matter of record, but we'll find out when we get to the hearing. So I guess the direction is to try to set something up for a meeting in January that we would hear the 20 items.

LEE: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: The next item.

LEE: Evan, do you want to provide the information on the strategy that we are now recommending in terms of capital facilities.

DUST: For the record Evan Dust, Long-Range Planning, Clark County. Staff in reaction to a request from the Board of County Commissioners went back to reconsider our approach on capital facilities. The approach that we have come up with now is to focus on the required financially constrained portion of the capital facilities plans for the incorporated area namely the first 6 years of the 20 years that is required to meet the financial constraint. With the exception of transportation we do not have a project list for 7 to 20 years from providers, we do have a project list for transportation that covers years 7 through 20, it is generally consistent with the revenue perspective that was provided to you and that you have reviewed in previous hearings.

Probably the biggest difference with this approach is recognizing that the first 6 years is probably what we have the greatest confidence in in terms of funding and recognizing that this plan can accommodate 80 percent of the expected 20 year growth within the urban growth boundaries that already exist. We recognize that it is most likely that this first 6 years of financially constrained projects is likely to provide an acceptable level-of-service. That full test of level-of-service, particularly for transportation, will not be accomplished until next year when we go through the process of examining the 20 year project list and testing whatever proposed land use plan the Board of County Commissioners finally adopts by the end of this year.

We have presented to you a staff report Updated County Capital Facilities Plans dated today's date that walks through this tabulation of capital facilities of those provided by the County for transportation in the unincorporated areas, parks and open space for unincorporated areas through Clark-Vancouver Parks, stormwater drainage and water quality facilities for the unincorporated areas, wastewater treatment, County buildings and other facilities. It also tabulates capital facilities plans that are prepared by other providers

and that are typically identified by reference in our comprehensive plan process, namely water supply and conveyance by Clark Public Utilities, water supply and conveyance by the city of Vancouver, wastewater collection and conveyance by Hazel Dell Sewer District, wastewater collection, conveyance and treatment by the City of Vancouver and schools.

In all cases for the most part the tabulated information provided in this updated staff report indicates that for the 6-year period we meet the financially constrained test for capital facilities. In particular I'd note that the material that we're providing you on storm drainage and water quality is essentially a draft, it requires a little bit more refinement and work with staff from the Clean Water Program, but generally the finding would be the same, that we can meet with expected revenues the expected 6 year expenditures. The other notable exception is there is some information that we will probably need to review with school districts as to why the identified major projects within school districts don't seem -- that total cost doesn't seem to match the total of the secured and unsecured funding identified by those districts in their already adopted capital facilities plans. And with that I return it to the Chair for questions from the Commission.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Dust? Just for matter of record, we did have a workshop on this prior to the meeting so the Commission had the opportunity to ask some questions at that time. Ron.

BARCA: So we have this new capital facilities plan shrunk down to a 6-year period and in essence the items in which we are bound to meet the funding requirements for we're able to show adequate revenue during that 6-year period of time?

DUST: That is correct for most cases, subject to review of material with school districts about the issue of secured and unsecured funding tabulation.

LOWRY: Just a minor correction, the capital facilities plan --

LEIN: Rich, identify yourself, please.

LOWRY: Oh, excuse me. Rich Lowry, County Prosecutor's Office. The capital facility plan itself must be for the full 20 years and it must include a full 20 years worth of projects. A 10 year forecast of demand is required, but the financial element of the capital facilities plan only needs to be for 6 years, the fiscally constrained portion.

BARCA: Okay. So when we got our capital facilities plan that was over the 20 year horizon and it showed us constrained in so many aspects of the capital facilities plan to meet the revenue forecasts, all of that is beyond the scope of the 6 years. So we're good the first 6 years, but then we get like really bad after that?

LEE: Well, I would not draw that absolute conclusion. I think you get out beyond 6 years you're dealing with a lot of uncertainty in terms of funding issues, so it makes it difficult to

demonstrate that you have secured funding over a 20-year period. The financial balancing requirement as Rich just mentioned in GMA is for 6 years and that is what we are providing. We have provided a 20 year forecast transportation demand for example for the proposed plan and we have working with the school districts identified based on the proposed plan what potential school enrollments may be over that 20-year period, but they are not constrained to have to demonstrate a revenue stream over 20 years to support that demand.

LOWRY: Rich Lowry again. One of the implications going to a 6 year fiscally constrained element of the plan is it suggests that if we don't have projects within the 6 years that would support growth in the expansion areas that those expansion areas need to stay in holding until projects for those expansion areas get on the 6-year plan, so the implication of doing it this way is the 6-year plan becomes more of a land use tool than it historically has.

BARCA: So based on what Rich just said is that one of the strategies towards the aspect of balancing the limited revenues is then in essence the potential areas of growth are really not released for development until we're able to bring them in with a funding or a revenue stream?

LEE: Yes, I believe that we -- the staff recommendation is still that you apply urban holding to the urban growth boundary expansion areas. And the urban holding language that we've reviewed in the work session and have discussed in deliberations in the past has suggested that we do sort of a subarea planning that would then make sure that we pull together the information that would be necessary to demonstrate facilities would be available to support development and then you could based on that go for example through the TIP program and identify projects and funding for the projects to make that happen.

BARCA: So that's one of the primary differences in what we saw before when the EIS came out and the draft capital facilities plan was put forward is now we're not trying to project actual revenue streams for the rest of that development, we're looking at it more on a 6-year increment and not saying that we're really projecting any additional revenues beyond that for projects that aren't opened up or identified.

LEE: Well, I think we have done the revenue perspective which identifies a 20 year look at what anticipated revenues would be, how you apply those revenues, yeah, that might be adjusted on an annual basis through some of these funding implementation programs for projects.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

SMITH: If you remove schools from these calculations, it appears all together our expended revenue exceeds our expected expenditures by about \$50 million, how do we reconcile that? Is it we're going to have a (inaudible) going into the next (inaudible)?

LEE: Well, I think -- well, we will discuss that a little further with a couple of the providers and with some of our own people, but I think one of the things that may be happening is they're tying expenditures to completion of projects as opposed to tying it to what may be needed and proposed but so the costs are on the basis of what would be completed in the time frame as opposed to maybe having gotten a start on it but not completed the project.

LEIN: I have a quick question on Item g, it's the City of Vancouver sewer system capital improvement program, the third --

LEE: I'm sorry, Vaughn, I missed the --

LEIN: Item g, the last page, the third page. At the end of that page it has two, it has an item called Program; Sewer, Water, and then Capital Program, Utility Operating, I guess reserves, no. What would "REV" stand for, revenue and then reserves?

DUST: Correct.

LEIN: Where does this fall within the other information? Is this a similar program or an outside program?

DUST: That sheet that is described as the funding, that's on the funding estimate for sewer system; correct?

LEIN: The last page, yeah.

DUST: The last page. The City provided revenue estimates for the 6-year period for all their utilities so I could identify that, you know, sewer system development charges belong to sewer capital costs but the utility operating revenues for capital and the utility capital reserves were not broken out as to which utility that revenue stream would be applied. So in order to make an estimate of that I prorated those values based on the size of the capital programs for sewer and water, so you see as that table below that works through it shows how that prorating was estimated in the sense that sewer has a capital program of 18 million over the 6 years over the total capital program for sewer and water which is 60. So if I take 18 60ths of the 24 million that's identified as utility operating revenue for capital and divide, I would end up with about 7.3 million of that revenue stream belonging to the sewer program and 16.6 million belonging to the water program.

LEIN: Okay. And it's doesn't balance because of how you round it?

DUST: It probably doesn't balance because of the -- well, all I have is the revenue on the one side and I have the expenses on the other. The other thing that could be going on there is if you have revenue that's allocated to capital and you know that you have a fairly hefty capital project that's going to fall in let's say year 8 of the 20, you might be saving. Just like the family puts money aside for a large purchase, a utility may put money aside or

create capital reserves from revenue. So there may be, there may be revenue that's coming in that is not being allocated to the capital expenses of that first 6 years but are being, is being used to bolster the capital reserves that will then be drawn for capital projects in a following 6-year period.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Other questions of staff?

MOSS: Yeah. On Page 7 here, is it, it seems to me that it isn't really legitimate, and maybe I don't understand the accounting process here, but it seems that it isn't legitimate to count rent savings of \$6 million as revenue. Why am I looking at that wrong? I mean money not spent becomes revenue.

DUST: If you don't spend the money one place, you can spend it someplace else.

MOSS: Why isn't that just an earmarked source?

DUST: And we're tabulating this from information provided by Office of Budget and General Services. So this is the way that the information was provided to us and we're just tabulating and reporting it in that fashion.

LEIN: But you're right, it's just still additional revenue coming in only it's not being expended as rent as it has been in the last few years. Other questions or comments? Is this something we would move forward with a motion at this time, Pat, or do you want to wait until later?

LEE: I would love to get a motion. I don't know if the Planning Commission is ready to provide a motion but, you know, certainly to the extent that we could endorse the strategy and subject to the refinements that we've suggested recommend that it proceed on to the Board, that would be appreciated.

LEIN: Desires of the Commission? Ron.

BARCA: We got this in work session, it's the first time we've seen it, I find it fascinating how many of these budgets balance exactly during the 6-year period, I think it's remarkable that there is so much money available to have them balance out in this fashion. You know, I don't deal in multi-million dollar projects very often, but I have trouble when it's in the thousands getting things to balance out really well. I'm looking at this and I'm just thinking then basically by us accepting this, this is an endorsement of the preferred alternative and all of the land use changes that go with it because this document says then we can pay for it.

LOWRY: Understand that's probably true for Vancouver but not for the other jurisdictions. We have not done capital facilities planning for any of the Cities and they haven't done them.

BARCA: And that was going to be my point. But this is basically an endorsement of the proposed alternative in the extent of what data is here, but it doesn't allow us to craft the entire land use changes that we feel we need to make and then know where the whole thing balances out, where the checkbook matches across the county or not. So I guess my preference would be for us to get through the land part and continue to work with the capital facilities plan and see if it still makes sense when it's all said and done. If it's a policy matter of saying that the 6 year portion of it can show that it's good, I, you know, I don't see how we can do anything about that, that's basically within the context of saying this is where the funding needs to be drawn to, this is the 6 year line, but we don't have all of the changes across the county in this, we have Vancouver and Hazel Dell Sewer and the County's portion of it.

LEIN: Correct. Clark Public Utilities.

BARCA: Okay. The PUD as countywide. So how do the rest of my fellow Commissioners feel about that aspect of this?

WRISTON: Well, I agree because I -- I mean unfortunately we weren't able to make it to the work session until -- we were late to the work session so we didn't get to discuss this in any detail so it's difficult to get through it. I realize it's just a revised version and we've seen some of this but --

LEE: One way to take, one way to look at it, is basically this proposal is in many ways a readoption of what the existing land uses and that program is with inside the existing UGA because that's where the money is being expended. It does not address as Rich has indicated the expanded urban growth areas, but it does support existing comp plans which are not being recommended for change in the unincorporated area.

BARCA: Thank you for that clarification.

LEE: And I would also say in relative to Vancouver, I mean it includes water and it includes sewer for the service area including the city limits of Vancouver, it includes information from Vancouver and Evergreen School Districts, it does not include other capital facilities information from the City of Vancouver and as we've indicated, one of the dilemmas that we face is that deliberately, conscious of the limited resources they're dealing with, completion of capital facilities plans by the Cities for the expanded urban growth areas is not programmed until after the Board establishes where the urban growth boundaries are and that is why we're suggesting urban holding in those areas.

DELEISSEGUES: I think as far as the strategy goes it's good. I think as far as some of the information, you know, it does need more work. So where the balances don't balance out or we have to go back to the schools and find out some additional information or whatever, but, you know, we could adopt the strategy and then when the numbers are

finalized, we could go ahead and approve the whole thing for a recommendation.

LEIN: Yeah, I think staff indicated that they need to go back and work with the school districts fairly extensively, some of them balanced out, some of them I just don't think understood how to put their information down as unsecured financing with the bonds. So do we want to move ahead with this and re-address it or do we want to accept it in terms of the strategy knowing that this will get some reworking as it moves forward?

DELEISSEGUES: I think we could do that.

WRISTON: So if we accept it in terms of the strategy, this is the last time we see it then we're saying, it just moves forward?

LEE: No, we could bring it back with the refinements included.

RUPLEY: I'll make a **MOTION THAT WE MOVE THIS FORWARD.** Also that we get to see it again with the refinements.

LEIN: Is there a **second** to the motion?

MOSS: **Yes.**

LEIN: Okay. Any additional comment or discussion?

WRISTON: Well, we're saying we move it, so we're moving it forward but then we're going to see it with the refinements --

LEIN: With the refinements as we --

WRISTON: But it's already moving forward so we're saying --

LEIN: The strategies, yes.

WRISTON: The strategies are moving forward?

LEIN: Yes.

WRISTON: And then the refinements come to us and then that moves forward is what we're saying?

LEIN: Correct.

BARCA: Mr. Chairman.

LEIN: Yes.

BARCA: Could you clarify what the strategies are that we're moving forward? No, I don't want to hear it from staff.

LEIN: I think Page 2 summarizes most of the strategies. The County provided capital facilities and capital facilities for the unincorporated areas and the strategy is a balanced 6-year plan.

BARCA: Okay. So the items as noted in here we're accepting in the 6-year plan as being solvent and we're moving those budgets forward?

LEIN: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. So it isn't really strategies, we are moving, accepting these budgets and moving them forward.

LEIN: But it's coming back to us.

BARCA: But it will come back to us, yeah.

RUPLEY: With the revisions, especially school districts.

LEIN: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: So my question is: Why don't we wait until it comes back to us and then approve it?

LEE: That would make sense.

WRISTON: I guess that's what I asked.

LEIN: If it's going to come back to us, yeah.

LEE: You've asked us for -- well, one thing we have to add the strategic list, the 7 to 20 year for transportation that is not in the packet. We'll check with the school districts and we'll check with the particularly the City of Vancouver Water and Sewer and what the breakout of capital reserves, was it capital reserves might be, revenue side.

LEIN: Okay. So we'll see this --

LEE: And we'll try and do that before Monday or by Monday.

LEIN: Okay. Next piece, Mr. Lee.

LEE: At this point let me ask what the preference of the Commission is. We do have some revised urban holding language, we do have some revised no net loss of industrial lands language that if those two pieces were completed would allow as I recall the comp plan text to move forward to the Board or we could begin to go into the map changes focusing UGA-by-UGA and review those. So what is your preference in terms of sequence?

WRISTON: Well, it's my understanding that on the at least as it relates to the urban holding, but I'm not sure it doesn't make sense with the no net loss as well that we were going to kind of go look at the map first UGA-by-UGA kind of, that way we're kind of seeing how it would apply, how the urban holding would apply before we, I think that was, I thought that was your suggestion anyway before we went on to --

LEE: Yeah.

WRISTON: -- reviewing the specifics of the language.

LEE: I just -- we had provided some revised wording for both of those policies in the work session so I didn't know if you wanted to change course at this point. So we can proceed --

WRISTON: Yeah, I'd rather. I mean that's what I'd rather do is go through and see as we go through it we can talk about it too because some of the revised language relates to very specific areas and we can look at those areas and see how what the rationale is for the language.

LEIN: Okay. Why don't we proceed with that.

LEE: Okay. You want to turn on the projector there. You have two map packets that were placed on your desk that will be kind of the principal tools that we'll use to review the proposed changes that staff is suggesting based on the testimony that we've heard. There is one map that there's a map, a series of maps in each packet, one starts with Yacolt and the other starts with Washougal. The one starting with Yacolt is it goes UGA-by-UGA. It identifies the site-specific requests that have come in and there is an indication whether or not the proposed site-specific request is incorporated into the plan that we are now proposing or not. It does not necessarily -- if you see, yes, it does not necessarily mean that if there was a request to come in as residential into the urban growth area that it was necessarily proposed, it's not necessarily proposed for a zoning for residential, it could be proposed for zoning for business park, but it is brought into the urban growth boundary.

The other map packet beginning with Washougal actually looks at the revised land use designations and boundaries that we are suggesting for each urban growth area and there has been some significant revisions in the proposed land use plan and I would think that

based on those revisions there's probably a higher percentage of site-specific requests that are proposed to be brought into the urban growth areas now than that are being brought in consistent with what their request was than before. So those are the two map packets that we have.

And just to orient you to the map packets, we have Yacolt is very simple so do you want to point, you got the pointer, point to that site-specific. Oh, I've got the pointer, okay, sorry. For example the light green indicates the site-specific request. That is what that denotes. The red indicates the proposed urban growth area and that is sort of the format of the site-specific. And the designation 3-019, if you have your site-specific spreadsheets that means the 2003-019A case number that was assigned to the site-specific requests. So that is, that is how to orient yourself to that particular map.

DELEISSEGUES: Pat, could you go over the yes, no, part of that.

LEE: Yes. The yes, no, is "yes" means this was proposed to be brought into the urban growth boundary; "no" means it was not proposed to be brought into the urban growth boundary, it was not proposed to change in designation.

DELEISSEGUES: Not proposed by the City.

RUPLEY: Or by the County.

LEE: By the County. Do you have a specific map that you're looking at? You have a question that you might want me to demonstrate it.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I'm just looking at the one that you've got on there.

LEE: Okay. That, the site-specific, Yacolt proposed no changes to the urban growth area and we are not proposing any changes. There was the site-specific request 3-019A that was submitted by private property owners. The "no" means that we are not recommending that that be approved. Okay.

The other map is the zoning map and if you go to Washougal again it's a pretty easy one. The colors indicate again you have generally the heavier red line denoting the proposed urban growth boundary and the change in color indicates what we are now proposing be the land use in that area. For example, this is the Camas School District school site that I'm pointing to in green that was in the Washougal urban reserve but that the school district recommend to be brought into the urban growth boundary since they are expecting to commence construction within the next couple of years. So in this case we are agreeing with the school district, we are recommending a change from what was the proposed land use map that we are now suggesting that this area be brought into the Washougal urban growth area now and be designated for public facilities.

LEIN: Dick.

DELEISSEGUES: And in the case of the yellow above that they're recommending that that not be included in the --

LEE: That actually is over on the next map --

LEIN: Camas.

LEE: -- Camas. And we can get into that when we go there. Okay. So I think -- and I know these are fairly large maps but it's probably useful to try and work them together so you can see the relationship between the site-specific requests and the proposed land uses. And unfortunately we'll probably only be able to alternate here and I think the easier map to follow is the proposed land use designation map.

DUST: What do you want up first?

LEE: And I think that the order that I am suggesting we review these is sort of Washougal, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Battle Ground and Vancouver. In Vancouver we have several maps, I think we have perhaps five, five maps. Since it's a large UGA we broke it out so you could read them more easily. So Washougal, the zoning as we were just reviewing the only -- Washougal did not request an expansion of the urban growth boundary and the only change that we are recommending from the proposed plan is to bring in the school site. And there were a couple of site-specific requests, I believe you have, and I need to get my glasses on so I can see the light green lines, this I believe is, is that the MacDonald?

TOWNE: Yes.

LEE: That's the MacDonald property. They wanted to go from agriculture to rural 5. This request 3-070 was proposing to go to rural from rural 5 to residential, urban low residential 1 point, R1-6 zoning, but we are not recommending that. The City did not feel a need to bring in additional land, they feel that they can accommodate the growth that we are suggesting they do within their existing urban growth boundaries. And I don't know if -- again I would ask the preference of the Commission, if they would want to for example have discussion on each of these as we're going through, perhaps take a straw vote whether to support the staff recommendation or to revise the staff recommendation at this point.

WRISTON: Yeah, I was just whispering to Vaughn I think it would be easier if we did these one at a time, get the discussion and get the motion and move them forward. Some are going to be easier than others, but I don't see a reason why we'd go through all of them and then come back, we'd just end up revisiting more discussion and I think it would slow us down.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I agree with Jeff.

RUPLEY: Me too.

WRISTON: So we can start with Yacolt; right? Didn't we just do Yacolt?

LEE: Yacolt, we're not proposing any change from the proposed plan.

WRISTON: Right. Right. And no zoning change either?

LEE: No.

WRISTON: So I'd **move to approve Yacolt**.

DELEISSEGUES: I'd **second** it.

LEIN: Any discussion further on Yacolt? Could we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MOSS:	AYE
BARCA:	AYE
SMITH:	AYE
WRISTON:	AYE
RUPLEY:	AYE
DELEISSEGUES:	AYE
LEIN:	AYE

WRISTON: Man, we're cruising, we should break.

LEE: Can we do Washougal next since we've already done that. Again the only change that staff is recommending at this time is to bring in the Camas School District site that is currently in the Washougal urban reserve, actually bring it into the urban growth boundary at this time.

LEIN: Any questions or comments?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I've got a question on the urban reserve for Washougal. How are we dealing with that, the gray on the land use map, the zoning map?

LEE: I'm not sure I understand the question how are we. It is -- I believe it's in is it industrial urban reserve?

BARCA: Part of it.

SMITH: I've got both.

ORJIAKO: It is an existing.

LEE: Yeah, it's an existing urban reserve so it doesn't represent a change to the current urban reserve designation there and Washougal indicated that yes, they would keep it, like to keep it as an urban reserve.

DELEISSEGUES: So if we voted in support of the Washougal recommendation, it would include the shown urban reserve on the map?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEE: Yes, if you were voting in support of what staff is now recommending, you would be supporting bringing in the school site into the urban growth boundary instead of leaving that particular site in urban reserve, but the rest of the urban reserve would remain urban reserve for Washougal.

DELEISSEGUES: So would that be subject to the amended urban reserve language that we went over in the workshop?

LEE: That is -- no, we were talking about urban holding. The urban reserve is actually outside of the urban growth area.

LEIN: So Washougal has no urban holding being designated; is that correct?

LEE: No, there's no new urban holding being designated in Washougal.

ORJIAKO: No.

SMITH: The urban reserve, the gray indicates urban reserve on that one?

LEE: That's urban reserve. Remember, there's a difference, urban reserve and urban holding are two different things. Urban holding is inside the urban growth boundary. It is anticipated to be needed within the 20-year period but we wanted to assure that capital facilities, et cetera, were able to get to the site before actually allowing the area to develop; whereas urban reserve is outside of the urban growth area post 20 year land use need that could be revisited after 10 years. It would be one of the areas that we would expect to move into the next time we take a look at urban growth boundaries if in fact we needed to bring in some additional urban land.

LEIN: But it's true there's no urban holding within, inside the boundary on Washougal?

LEE: Right, they were not proposing any expansion of the urban growth boundary.

SMITH: There's an area on our maps that is shaded as existing urban reserve that is not shaded on the map up there. You take that gray area and there's a square out of the upper right-hand corner, on our maps that's shaded as urban reserve.

LEE: Here?

SMITH: No, to the left. Further left. A little bit more left. Right there. Up. Right to the right, that little square. That square is shaded on ours as urban reserve on these maps.

MOSS: Well, there are several properties there, aren't there?

SMITH: Yeah, there's at least three properties.

ANDERSON: That's true. Mapping error on my part. It's existing urban reserve now.

LEE: So that should in fact be existing urban reserve that whole northern tier.

LEIN: And that's what we have on our map.

LEE: Yes, that is what you have on the individual map here.

ORJIAKO: And Oliver Orjiako. If I can add, the Planning Commission can make a motion that all of the existing urban reserve be retained in the Washougal urban growth area.

LEIN: Or if we just agree with staff, it will automatically go there.

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: I need some help here on this, how to read these, remind me again what the paren yes, paren no means?

LEE: Those refer to site-specific requests that were received. For example, in that the school site is designated site-specific request 2003-068.

WRISTON: Right. And when we say "yes"?

LEE: "Yes" means that the request was to bring it into the urban growth boundary. "Yes" means we are recommending now to bring that into the urban growth boundary.

WRISTON: It means you are recommending, okay. You are? Not the Cities, you?

LEE: That is correct.

WRISTON: Okay. And then when I compare the -- and then when I go here to compare the zoning map, the map, so you've redrawn, see because like on the City one or on the, not the City one but on the school district one, when you redrew the line you kind of put a red line there to show where the new line is going to go and then when it goes over to the zoning map that red line turns to burgundy or whatever, but then on these other yeses there's no red line, it just, it's changed on the UGA map but on the zoning map where we say "yes" it hasn't changed yet.

LEE: Okay. That is actually it's the same area but I think it's -- do you want to go back so you can see the school site, okay, so you're, yeah, if I -- we have a little unique circumstance here. This area, that's where we said "yes" in the proposed, well, in the site-specific we're saying "City yes." Is that what you see on the map, "City yes"?

WRISTON: Yeah, there's a couple, there's a couple of them. It's that area where you're pointing to.

LEE: Right. That is because when we drew the proposed plan we incorrectly followed the recommendation of the City of Camas on where the urban growth boundary should be. They are now saying they do not want this in the urban growth boundary. The proposed plan showed this in the urban growth boundary and they said that was not our proposal. Again it was our mistake in trying to transpose their boundaries onto our map. So we are agreeing now to take that out of the urban growth boundary.

WRISTON: So where we say "City yes" here --

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: -- and then also up here too? I mean it --

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: -- this line here goes straight and that doesn't show up, but it goes straight across now. At least on the zoning map it appears to or does it go -- see, the zoning map doesn't go out as far as --

LEE: You have to go to the next map, to the Camas map, to see the entire zoning across the --

LEIN: It's the R1-6 piece.

WRISTON: Okay. So it does --

LEE: These particular ones are pretty unique. With the exception of Vancouver most of the time we're saying "City yes," the city has proposed to expand the urban growth boundary and we are agreeing, but this one is a little different.

WRISTON: Okay. So I see, so I popped over into Camas.

LEE: Yeah. And we don't have to deal with that now, we can do that when we get to Camas.

WRISTON: No, I understand. Okay. I apologize. I can see where I was getting confused, I popped over into Camas. Got you.

LOWRY: One, Rich Lowry again. One quick explanation as to why the urban reserve shows up in one place on one set of maps and it didn't show up on the overhead, my assumption is that the property that didn't show up on the overhead is in some sort of resource zoning and the urban reserve is an overlay for resource lands and so that is why I think there's a distinction. In one set of maps picked up the overlay and the other did not.

WRISTON: Okay. I can see why on the 02-045 that we would say no. What was the name attached or what circumstances around the 3-070? I mean I can see it doesn't, it's odd, it's a tail, it doesn't bring in --

LEE: Right. One, the City of Washougal felt they could accommodate the population within the existing urban growth boundary, they did not need that land to accommodate the 20-year population. Two, I think our thinking it is discontinuous from the urban growth boundary, there's a line of parcels in between that did not suggest an adjustment.

WRISTON: Okay. Did we get testimony on that one? Out of curiosity.

LEE: I don't know if we received written testimony on that particular one or not. I don't believe we did, but I honestly don't recall each individual that testified and about which parcel.

WRISTON: Okay. We don't have that. Well, I know we don't, but I mean we don't have them, the testimony, docketed anywhere in terms of --

TOWNE: I might if you give me a minute.

WRISTON: Well, yeah, as we, you know, as we go through this, through them, especially when we start getting into more of them when, you know, I wrote notes on every one that I heard, but I didn't write down, I probably should have, I didn't reference, I wrote names, not

numbers.

LEE: We did receive testimony on 2-045.

WRISTON: Okay. And that's fine because that one just doesn't make sense at all. I mean it's not even on the fringe I don't think, it would be hard to --

LEE: That was our conclusion.

WRISTON: And I'm trying to figure out how to associate the testimony with the parcels so that I can at least look on my notes to see what the argument was on behalf of the applicant.

LEIN: Questions of staff? Comments?

MOSS: Yeah, who requested 3-068?

LEE: 3-068, that was the school district.

MOSS: But 3-068 extends way over to the west there.

LEE: Yes. I think in that particular case the line should be going to the parcel to the left of the parcel that it's pointing at. It's on the Camas map, as you probably flip over to the Camas map, if you want to look at that particular one.

MOSS: Well, it's the same direction there. 3-068 refers to the parcel in Washougal, the school parcel, but it also refers -- there's a leader going directly up.

WRISTON: Going up.

LEE: Yes. Yes, there is. It's the Camas School District suggested two school sites in Camas and one school site in the Washougal UGA.

WRISTON: That's right.

RUPLEY: So you're saying "yes" to all of them?

LEE: Yes.

LEIN: But we're just addressing this one right now because it's in Washougal.

LEE: Yes, because the two within the Camas UGA were included in the proposed plan, it's the one that is in the Washougal UGA that was not included in the proposed plan.

DELEISSEGUES: Are we talking about Camas now or just Washougal?

LEE: We're talking about the Camas School District, but they have properties in both the Camas urban growth area and the Washougal urban growth area.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. I've got some questions on Camas but we're dealing with Washougal essentially right now; right?

LEE: Yeah. We're dealing with the Washougal UGA, yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thanks.

LEIN: Other questions or comments on Washougal?

WRISTON: Sandra, have you figured out a way to associate numbers to names or --

TOWNE: Well, unfortunately I don't have my large book of testimony with me tonight, but the one that you were asking about did not testify because I do have a list of all who testified. So it was 2003-070; is that correct?

WRISTON: Right. So you have a list of who testified. Does that list associate to a name too so that if we ask you a number --

TOWNE: Yes.

WRISTON: -- you can give us a name and then we can look at our notes?

TOWNE: Yes. I'm hoping I'll be able to find it, yes.

WRISTON: Okay. So if we ask, great.

TOWNE: But give me a little time though, I have to look through it.

WRISTON: Sure. No, that would be helpful. Thanks. I'll make a motion --

LEIN: Certainly.

WRISTON: -- to approve Washougal's urban growth boundary and comp plan designations. Are we going to try to do them -- yeah, do them both.

DELEISSEGUES: I'll second it.

LEIN: Further discussion?

BARCA: May I have the motion repeated, please.

WRISTON: To approve Washougal's proposed urban growth boundaries and comp plan designations, which is a part of that would also I guess approve the existing or reaffirm the existing urban reserves is what we're saying; right?

LEIN: Correct.

LEE: Yes.

LEIN: And it would add the Camas School District site, (inaudible) recommendation.

WRISTON: Right. Yes.

BARCA: So the motion is to accept staff's recommendation for the --

WRISTON: UGAs and for the comp plan designation.

BARCA: And the comp plan designation. Thank you.

LEIN: Could we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MOSS:	AYE
BARCA:	AYE
SMITH:	AYE
WRISTON:	AYE
RUPLEY:	AYE
DELEISSEGUES:	AYE
LEIN:	AYE

LEIN: Camas.

LEE: Are you ready to move on to Camas?

LEIN: Yes.

LEE: Okay. In terms of Camas, I think we are -- actually I believe that -- do you want to put up the zoning map. Now if I am not mistaken this R1-6 was in fact recommended in the proposed plan, it's just that this portion was taken out of the UGA at the request of the City of Camas. That was the issue that Jeff had brought up earlier, that particular one. These are the two school sites in the Camas School District in the Camas UGA that were

included in the proposed comp plan, so there is no change there. Can you get to the top and get in Green Mountain.

DUST: Do you want more map?

LEE: Yeah, more map at the top. I guess we'll have to go to a different, we'll have to go to 162nd for that one.

DUST: Where do you want to go, Pat?

LEE: Why don't you go to the site-specific. Originally this is the Green Mountain proposal up here that they wanted to bring into the urban growth boundary as a mixed use development. This is what was shown on the proposed plan, this triangular piece, as a park site. Originally it is primarily a wetlands area and I believe, and, Carey, you may know, there may be some easements or something that are on that property at this point, though I don't know this.

SMITH: I know the Nature Conservancy was doing a lot of work there.

LEE: Yeah. Yeah.

WRISTON: That whole piece you're saying?

LEE: The triangle piece --

WRISTON: That's in?

LEE: And that is, yeah.

WRISTON: That were proposed to be in?

LEE: Except there is a site-specific request here that's the water skiing lake.

LEIN: Just that narrow band?

LEE: Yeah, that narrow band and little --

WRISTON: And that one has "no" on it?

LEE: Yes. So we are not recommending approval of that change. And that change I believe was to go from an Ag-20 to residential low density, 1-6 zoning.

WRISTON: Oh, okay, that's a zoning change not a, because the boundary --

LEE: No, it was a comp plan change too because it's currently Ag-20 and they'd want to go from Ag-20 to urban low density.

WRISTON: Right. But it's not a growth boundary change is what I'm saying?

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: The boundary it's on, it's in?

LEE: Right. We are recommending that the boundary stay south of Lacamas Creek here and therefore we are saying no to both the Green Mountain request and the water skiing lake request there. As you work your way down, why don't you go back to the zoning map now, as you work your way down this is the, this portion here, the blue that, well, the dividing line here is the negotiated urban growth area boundary between the cities of Vancouver and Camas, so these are currently unincorporated islands between the two cities. We are recommending that the islands be brought into the urban growth boundary, including up to Lacamas Creek, and that this be designated as an employment district, employment district with some residential.

And the change that we heard, this is the Fisher Quarry site, and the changes, a couple of changes that we heard based on testimony, Mr. King and a few other property owners right here wanted to be R1-10. Columbia Vista Corporation and Kiewit Construction own this 14-acre parcel on the river side of Highway 14, they wanted to be heavy manufacturing to reflect the existing use that is there, and again this some residential over here, and we are recommending those changes at this time. In other words, we're agreeing with what the property owner requests are for those areas.

MOSS: Aren't those Vancouver requests though?

LEE: Yes, they are Vancouver. That would be in the Vancouver urban growth boundary and the City of Vancouver also supports the changes.

WRISTON: Okay. But then we'll talk about them during Vancouver or during Camas?

LEE: Yes. But actually it's because you're right on the boundary here, if I just took advantage of the map and in terms of, do you want to go to the site-specific request map, in terms of there are several site-specific requests along the northeast shoreline of Lacamas Lake. Most are requesting to go from either Ag-20 to Rural 5 acre minimum lot size or R-10 to Rural 10 acre minimum lot size to R1-6 urban low. We believe that along the northern shoreline it is appropriate to keep the existing designation, so we are recommending no to those site-specific requests. There is one site-specific request that we did hear testimony from which is I believe it's Loveland.

WRISTON: Loveland?

LEE: Loveland, which is right -- they have a, I think they have about a 5-acre parcel right adjacent to the existing boundary and they want to go from I believe it is an R-5 to an urban low density residential and we are recommending approval of that.

TOWNE: R-10 to urban low.

LEE: R-10 to urban low density residential. And if you want to put the zoning map again, it probably pops out a little better.

WRISTON: Why are you recommending that?

LEE: It's immediately adjacent to the boundary. It's a small parcel. I think the property owner expressed a desire to split that particular lot, we felt it was a reasonable request.

WRISTON: And that's the 3-020?

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: Is that right?

DUST: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: There's a City of Camas memorandum dated June 16th and they had several areas on a map that accompanied that, and they were labeled area A, B, C through G, and I just wondered if there's any way you could relate the areas on the map to the request that the City made and what your recommendations were for each of those. If you don't have it, you could have this one.

LEE: I don't have a copy of that map in front of me. If you put it up there I could probably do it. Or Marty could do it if you would allow him to come to the podium and respond to the question.

SNELL: Good evening. For the record my name is Marty Snell with the City of Camas, P.O. Box 1055, 98607. The memo that we submitted went through a series of areas A through G. A and B are areas that were negotiated with the City of Vancouver and a compromise and on the maps that you have before you from your staff essentially everything from areas A through E are the compromised areas between the City of Camas and the City of Vancouver in the Fisher Swale area. Area G is kind of the Lacamas Heights area which includes the current high school site that has the horizontal hatching. And, yeah, those are the two green sites are the high schools, the school district properties, and then the R1-6.

DELEISSEGUES: So I guess my question was: Did the County recommendations fit with Camas and Vancouver? I guess that's --

SNELL: The County recommendation, with the exception of the Green Mountain property encapsulates the City's request. There has been very recent refinements based on a public hearing we held in the end of October and I had sent something to staff and it does pick up the smaller parcel that is attached to the 40 or 45-acre piece of the school district property. And it picks up the Loveland, it's about a four, four and a half acre site. And there's also a spec of ground that, well, you'd have to look at a different map, but it would take in a split parcel right on the shore of Lacamas Lake and that's not a very, maybe you can zoom in on that. Yeah, there's, the pen highlights that little spec of ground that was a split parcel right on along Lacamas Lake. And then there's a, moving over to the right, that's the Loveland piece on the top. And then that's the Loveland piece and then the school district property there.

LEE: So other than Green Mountain I think we are in agreement.

SNELL: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you.

BARCA: Marty, before you leave, the aspect of the Lacamas Heights addition, the R1-6 --

SNELL: Yes.

BARCA: -- where is Camas' commercial property that would be servicing that additional residential as well as the residential to the south of it?

SNELL: There's a bit of neighborhood commercial property just north of Round Lake, in this area right here, but if you come straight down Crown Road you're right in downtown Camas. So from this point down Crown Road into downtown is probably less than a two mile drive.

BARCA: Okay. That's what I needed to clarify. Thank you.

LEIN: Other questions of staff on Camas UGA or the other requests within or without?

DELEISSEGUES: I'd make a motion we go ahead and recommend approval of this proposal.

SMITH: Second.

LEIN: Moved and seconded. Any further discussion?

DELEISSEGUES: I ought to specify Camas.

BARCA: I'd like a clarification of the land that's considered environmentally constrained. And I believe the way that this proposal is it puts it into the Camas boundary, it would be in I guess what Marty just showed in the exhibit would have been D, I'm looking at it as just to the west of the 1-071 properties.

LEE: So you're talking in this area through here, there are certainly some wetland areas through this site.

BARCA: Yeah. Isn't that the area that is known as the swale or the --

LEE: We, I think County staff and I believe both the staff from the City of Vancouver and the City of Camas would probably agree that that would be a likely component -- at least some of the wetland areas would be a likely component of that open space corridor between the two cities that we are hoping to maintain. The exact extent of what that may be is probably not defined at this level, but would be defined through later refinement of the plans or through development proposals that are proposed in that area, but I think that it would be very logical to include those in some of that open space corridor.

BARCA: So it's recognized as an open issue to try and develop the open space in some fashion or as a corridor?

LOWRY: Rich Lowry again. Actually when you get to the urban holding policies for both Camas and Vancouver, there is a requirement that the open space corridor be addressed prior to the holding being removed.

BARCA: So then for the record, that particular, those particular parcels that we're in discussion on are going to be put into urban holding?

LEE: Yes. They would be proposed to be included into the in this case Camas urban growth boundary, and as an expansion to the urban growth boundary we would recommend that urban holding be placed subject to the urban holding language that we are currently recommending, but that which the Commission wants to discuss further.

BARCA: Okay. So as we've had the motion then, what we've just discussed here is part of the proposal that it comes in as urban holding subject to our discussion of what urban holding ends up being as defined by the Commission. Thank you.

WRISTON: I maybe just not have heard it, 10, right where he was talking actually, that 071 and 081, we're just saying yes, there, those are obviously comp plan designation requests?

LEE: Yes. Let's see.

WRISTON: Can you remind me what those are?

LEE: Let me get out my other map.

WRISTON: I've got a couple more questions for you on them, just on a couple of these just so that we know what they are.

LEE: Okay. 1-071 was a property owner request to go from urban reserve 10 to light manufacturing so that's 071. 081 was to go from urban reserve 20 to light manufacturing. Our proposal currently shows it as employment inside the urban growth boundary with an employment designation.

WRISTON: But it's as employment center?

LEE: Yes, that would be implemented either by business park or office campus.

WRISTON: Okay. That's not exactly a light industrial but --

MOSS: That's not light industrial.

WRISTON: Different than light industrial but --

DELEISSEGUES: On the Vancouver urban holding plan text proposal they had some language it says "so long as it can be demonstrated that sensitive environmental resources including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, floodplain and shorelines, geological hazards, priority species and habitats will be adequately protected." Maybe that's the language you were looking for.

WRISTON: We tweaked that language, didn't we?

LEE: Yes. Last week I think your recommendation was to substitute the sensitive environmental resources --

WRISTON: With the ordinance.

LEE: -- with subject to application of the appropriate critical area ordinances or something to that effect.

WRISTON: Okay. So 071 and 081 is, anyway, UR-20 to ML. What about, and maybe I missed this, the 12 that has "yes" up there just above it? See where I'm talking about?

LEE: 2003-012?

WRISTON: I just have 12 on mine.

MOSS: That's all it says.

WRISTON: But it could probably. Yeah, could be.

BARCA: Employment center.

LEE: Oh, that's the Strunk property I believe. It was proposed by Mr. Strunk. It is also a parcel that is being looked at very seriously by Evergreen School District and by Clark College as a new campus site, joint campus site.

WRISTON: Can they do that under employment center?

LEE: Yes, they can do that in the BP zone as a --

WRISTON: Conditional use.

LEE: I think based on the changes you made last week elementary and secondary schools will be a conditional use; junior colleges and colleges would be permitted outright.

WRISTON: That's right. And I think one last one, we have another 3-068. Is that the third Camas School District request kind of up there in the --

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: -- north? Okay. That's the third, so that large one in the middle kind of, that's just a big request though?

LEE: That's the high school site I believe.

WRISTON: That's the high school site, okay.

LEIN: Pat, what is happening west of the Strunk property? Is that 1-026? Does that refer to that piece or does that refer to the corner of 192nd?

LEE: No, actually I believe that's the Glad Tidings Church and they also had submitted a site-specific request. Let me see, I don't know if you can look it up faster than I can.

TOWNE: Sandra Towne. Glad Tidings is asking to go from agricultural with an urban reserve overlay on it to a mixed use and that's in, within the Vancouver UGA.

LEIN: Okay. Because the Vancouver UGA is on the east side of that property?

TOWNE: Yes.

LEIN: Okay. And then everything north of that where it says "County request in Vancouver UGA," that's all new?

LEE: Yes. That was an area that the Board recommended to be brought into the proposed plan and we are recommending based on the testimony that where you have -- we had quite a bit of testimony from residents of the particular area and we are recommending R1-10 just immediately north of the Strunk property. And then after you go above Goodwin Road, we are recommending R1-6.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Other questions? Could we have roll call then, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MOSS:	AYE
BARCA:	AYE
SMITH:	AYE
WRISTON:	AYE
RUPLEY:	AYE
DELEISSEGUES:	AYE
LEIN:	AYE

LEIN: Why don't we take a break and then we'll come back and continue with La Center.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: We'd like to reconvene the hearing. At this point we will continue on with the next city, that indeed would be La Center.

LEE: Colette will make the presentation from this point forward. Sorry, I was having a conversation out in the hall. La Center. There are some -- the City of La Center and the County do have some disagreements. First, if you want to put up the, okay, why don't you put up the zoning map. Okay, never mind. We'll do the site-specific maps. The City has proposed this Timmen Road's area on the south side of the river as a commercial site. We have received both oral testimony and significant written testimony from most of the property owners in this area saying they do not wish that to be in urban reserve, so we are recommending no change in the current designation in that area. The City has requested an urban reserve area here and urban reserve area sort of a discontinuous urban reserve area here and there and we concur with the City, but there is two parcels in between those that the City is proposing that we would also recommend then be designated urban reserve.

In terms of other site-specific requests we have 016. It's one property owner that owns including -- I believe it's the same property owner that owns part of that, but owns some discontinuous parcels here and here that I believe, let's see, are currently zoned FR-40 and they would, they are recommending to go to urban low residential 1.75. We do not agree with that --

WRISTON: Is there a name?

LEE: -- with those site-specific.

WRISTON: Was there any testimony or anything on that?

LEE: I do not believe we heard testimony from the individual, but you could look up the name. It's 0-016.

TOWNE: Hills is the name, H-i-l-l-s.

WRISTON: Thank you.

LEE: And do you want to put up the zoning map. Again, we're showing the staff recommended urban reserve. These residential additions were included in the proposed plan and we are sticking with that designation recommending an R1-6 zoning in those areas. And that is staff proposal.

LEIN: Now you have "no" on those, on the other --

LEE: No. No, those are separate parcels. Do you want to get the site-specific. I think these are, these are the parcels that we are recommending and the site-specifics are actually up here. It's the faint green lines are sometimes difficult to pick up.

WRISTON: What's the rationale on the 2-053, bringing that in?

LEIN: The one on the east side. That would be urban reserve.

LEE: That was actually a recommendation of the City to bring that in as urban reserve for to in essence probably precludes further parcelization so that it might be more useful for their post 20 year land supply.

LEIN: That's adjacent to the high school site, isn't it?

LEE: I don't believe it is immediately adjacent to the high school site.

TOWNE: No, it isn't adjacent.

LEE: I think there is a -- I think the high school site is perhaps around in this area.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

LEE: So it's a little further out.

TOWNE: And that parcel also is zoned Ag-20. So whether it has the urban reserve over it or not, it's a 20-acre piece. You know, it will be preserved as 20 acres.

WRISTON: Just, you know, what's the -- I mean you may not be able to answer this, I'm curious what their rationale is for that over, you know, the 0-016 or the 3-032? Or you know what I mean, they --

LEE: I don't know. We actually suggested that to the City at one point and they were pretty insistent that through their process they identified the parcel to the south there as the one that they felt most strongly about. So we were in essence supporting what the City recommended on that one.

WRISTON: To the east?

LEE: Yeah.

WRISTON: To the east, okay.

LEE: To the east and south of the, sort of the road that extends out there.

WRISTON: Right. Right, I got you.

TOWNE: And, Jeff, to answer your question, on the site-specific request for 016 did not testify.

WRISTON: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Further questions of staff?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, it just seems that the City made quite a pitch here through their memo that was dated September the 25th for some additional commercial zone for opportunity to create jobs and it looked like one of their main points in their presentation that they made to us was, you know, the zoning of the Timmen's down there and toward the Junction would be the first step in the City's goal of incremental growth toward the Junction consistent with the GMA. It says "the City ask that the Timmen's Road area be placed in urban reserve for mixed use employment purposes. The City sees it as its long-term future tied to the I-5 Interchange and Timmen's Road, a logical first step in the GMA process." It seems to me that that was a pretty important element in the presentation

that they made to us and I'm just wondering why the County didn't go along with their proposal?

LEE: I think first and foremost I don't believe we heard or saw either oral or written testimony from most of the property owners that were shown in that potential urban reserve, potential commercial location, and they were opposed to it. Secondly, I think we have always been concerned about the urban growth boundary extending across the river. I think we have heard testimony also that perhaps a more logical extension is to the north or to the east for the city as opposed to hopping across the river.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thanks.

BARCA: In that regard, is there a particular reason why no acreage was designated jobs in the recommendation from the County? We did see that they were requesting something and even though that particular parcel that was asked for by the City wasn't designated as appropriate, is there no other recommendation for jobs?

LEE: Well, as I -- the City does not have a representative here tonight to speak to that. Other than the parcel at La Center Junction on I-5, they had not proposed any employment lands under this commercial in their recommendations to us. And I know that one of the things they have had underway is a look at, you know, parcel, some parcels in their downtown area perhaps expanding some commercial uses in there, although it would be a very limited scale. So we did not go looking for places necessarily inside La Center, they did not propose a lot of employment other than the Junction. In our opinion the Ridgefield Junction has a better chance of being brought in for urban uses than the La Center Junction in the immediate future.

LEIN: Do you have any other questions? Comments from members of the Commission?

BARCA: I have a question in regard to what we have before us as the recommendation from the County. Then how many additional acres of residential property are we asking for to come in immediately?

LEE: I think it's like 40 acres. 40 or 60 acres. Hold on a minute, I may have the City's proposal.

TOWNE: Ron, the parcel to the east, the square that's urban reserve, that's a 40-acre piece, it's 39.5 acres. So just estimating, we don't have, haven't found the right amount at this point, I would say it's a little over, you know, it might be 60 acres. Those two yellow, maybe even close to 80 because of the small little square down below as well.

BARCA: And those are being proposed to come directly into the urban growth boundary?

LEE: Yes. They are actually I believe already in the urban reserve, are they not, Evan?

ORJIAKO: No.

TOWNE: No, they're not urban reserve.

LEE: No, okay. A portion of it is.

BARCA: And before we dig much further on this, the reason I'm asking this question is we have some property which is designated urban reserve currently and it seems like we're still having it remain urban reserve while we're adding additional property in as residential. I'm kind of trying to understand the thought process of why what was urban reserve before isn't brought in and then have other pieces of property designated as urban reserve in some kind of sequential demonstration.

LEE: Well, in developing the preferred plan the Board chose not to restrict expansion to urban reserve areas specifically. They made that conscientious policy decision and largely we are moving into urban reserve, in some cases we are not. So in terms of the direction we've received, that was not to be an absolute constraint. Given that that was not an absolute constraint, I think part of the other direction was that where there were a site-specific request or proposals from Cities to take a look at those as potentially the first areas for addition whether or not they were in urban reserve and that's how we approached it. Yeah, they apparently are not in urban reserve at this point, those pieces.

MOSS: Pat, is there any existing urban reserve?

LEE: La Center Junction has industrial reserve.

MOSS: Well, the reason I'm asking the question is I'm having a hard time relating the legend colors and patterns to the parcels that are shown as urban reserve. I'm having trouble with both the gray colors, you know, you have some solid gray there like the piece that's County yes, urban reserve, the piece that you added up there, you know, that matches the color for a City proposal.

LEE: The City proposed urban reserve on this parcel --

MOSS: Yeah, I understand.

LEE: -- and this parcel, but not in the intervening parcel, sort of, and we thought it made sense to bring those all in or designate them all consistent with the urban reserve.

MOSS: What I'm also having a little trouble with, though, is that you don't have any of that lighter gray color over here in your legend. You also have existing urban reserve and new urban reserve, it seems like the difference is really the spacing of the dots in the pattern and I don't find any of those existing.

LEE: Part of it's just the difficulties of trying to map the various permutations of urban reserve we have. We have some that are proposed by the Cities, some that are proposed by the Counties, some where Cities have proposed to expand urban reserve beyond what the staff is recommending, and some where Cities are suggesting that areas that we are suggesting be brought into the urban growth boundary instead be designated urban reserve. So we tried to identify each of those cases and in the mapping process and that may be some of the difficulty you're having in interpreting the colors because they represent some different variation of who proposed what.

TOWNE: I might help a little bit, the existing urban reserve is white with dots and your map reads a lot better than these maps up here because the machine really washes it out so your map would be better to read. And then the --

MOSS: But we have none of that. So there is no existing urban reserve?

LEE: Actually if you look on the site-specific request map, it picks it out a little bit better I suppose.

TOWNE: Then the new urban reserve is purple with dots, that kind of gray purple.

WRISTON: From our maps --

MOSS: I understand. But are you saying that there is no existing urban reserve in La Center?

TOWNE: That's correct. It's all proposed urban reserve.

WRISTON: Because we have kind of a weird -- we have the purple clearly. Then we kind of have like a hatched purple with dots.

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: And that's what I'm trying to figure out, what that is.

LEE: The hatched purple with dots was the City proposal, the darker purple with dots and without the hatching coming through is that additional parcel that the County suggests be brought in as urban reserve.

WRISTON: So there is no urban reserve, so we don't need to worry about that. I guess I was assuming there was.

MOSS: And the darker gray that the County is proposing which matches the legend for City proposal is understood to be different. Okay.

LEE: It was a difficult chore trying to map all these things.

WRISTON: I guess I'll say as we go through these I had the same concern Ron did. Actually I was going back and looking to see whether with Washougal or Camas whether we had expanded in areas outside of existing urban reserve and I didn't see where we had because it looked like Washougal was where the large portion of the existing urban reserve was and so I think we're okay so far.

BARCA: So far.

WRISTON: But I do think it's going to be an issue or is an issue to discuss because I think there's an expectation or an implication that those are kind of the next in. I know it's not a requirement, but it at one point that was --

LEE: There is a policy in the plan that suggested that urban reserves are the areas you look to expand urban growth boundaries into. When we were developing the alternatives, the Board told us not to constrain ourselves by that policy and so we've looked at both urban reserves and areas outside urban reserves to bring in. Largely our choice was to bring in urban reserve areas but not exclusively.

LEIN: Any other questions on La Center?

DELEISSEGUES: No, but I'd like to suggest that we defer this one until we can get a representative from the City of La Center to discuss it with us. There's a significant difference between the City proposal and the County proposal. I'd sure like to have the City have the opportunity to answer some of the questions that we have brought up here and, you know, give us some idea of how this will affect their plan. It says in the staff report dated September the 10th that they hope to finish the review of their plan in early November 2003 and in the event that they did finish their review of the plan, it might be a good time for them to come and give us some additional input as to how their review of that plan came out.

LEIN: They certainly could be invited to Monday night.

LEE: Yes, we can do that.

MOSS: Good idea.

LEIN: Is that the desires of the Commission?

BARCA: I am interested in trying to find out if there's an appropriate alternative to the aspect of job creation in land use designation. Within the context that the County is recommending that the property on the west side of the river not be included, I would be

interested to find out if there's an alternative in that regard than that's on the east or the north side of the river depending upon which bend you're dealing with. For commercial or business park I don't know what is appropriate, whatever the City might come back with. So, yeah, the recommendation to have the City come in and talk about the changes to the proposal that they had submitted I think would be appropriate.

LEE: Evan, you are taking copious notes, you're going to contact Eric and --

DUST: Correct.

LEE: -- relay the questions, okay, and invite him to show up on Monday?

LEIN: Or a representative. Any other comments on La Center? If we're not going to make any recommendations, we'll continue on with Ridgefield.

LEE: Okay, Ridgefield. This is an area where urban reserves get complicated. I mean we've heard a lot of testimony about the Ridgefield Junction area. Specifically you have the Port of Ridgefield property here, I believe up here you have the Seventh-Day Adventist Church that I think Mr. Howsley was representing. Here you have in general the Boschma property that Larry Wilson was representing, and you have the Walker property over here that Mr. Langsdorf was representing, and I think you have the Roher family over here and I believe perhaps Mr. Mayhook was representing them. In terms of -- so those are some of the testimony you heard either from the City or from individual property owners. The City's, has the City formally reconsidered the Ridgefield industrial property yet, Evan, do you know?

DUST: For the record, not that I know of.

LEE: Originally the City did not propose that this be included. They did propose, I believe, that over to 10th Street be included either in the urban growth boundary or as urban reserve, and I think they also suggested some areas out to 20th be included as urban reserve, and we are disagreeing with most of those as staff. We are recommending that the Port of Ridgefield property be brought in so they can plan this parcel with their adjoining parcel that is inside the urban growth boundary. We are recommending the addition along Pioneer Street that Ms. Bremer testified about, that be included. And other than that what was included on the existing plan was the school site down here.

We had a few other site-specific requests. We have a rural 5 to urban low density residential here that we are not recommending. Further up we have a couple of agricultural parcels that are suggesting change to rural 5. We have an agricultural parcel to a low density urban residential parcel here. I believe this is owned by a church. We have an individual property owner suggesting to go from UR-10, urban reserve 10, to low density residential R1-6 here. And we have I guess the City may have also proposed this as a potential industrial reserve at one point, but we do not feel that there is sufficient

undeveloped employment land within Ridgefield, that we are adding the Port property and the Pioneer Street extension property and then that provides a pretty significant jobs nucleus already and there was no further need to expand the boundary in that area at this time.

LEIN: Questions of staff?

LEE: Oh, I do want to make one other correction or addition. There were a couple of very small parcels right around here that are basically existing rural commercial parcels that are now designated Ag I believe and we are recommending that they be redesignated to rural commercial. I think both parcels are about an acre in size or so. They're very small.

LEIN: That would take in the store and the development across the street?

LEE: Yes.

LEIN: The fire station could be put into that then too?

LEE: And the fire district.

DELEISSEGUES: Where was Fire District 12's proposal?

LEIN: Right there, the same place.

DELEISSEGUES: The same place.

TOWNE: That's Rodney Smith.

LEE: Rodney Smith was the property owner in addition to the fire district in that sort of circular area.

LEIN: But it doesn't include the fire district's request for a new station which was going to be in one of the other parcels?

LEE: Well, it's unclear where. I don't believe that the fire district has a specific site picked out. They were hoping either together with the Port of Ridgefield or perhaps somewhere in this area, this is the church property, to perhaps look for a new site, though they had not negotiated an agreement for land or anything, it's just something that they were hoping to be able to negotiate.

WRISTON: Where's the church property again?

LEE: The Seventh-Day Adventist Church is right here.

WRISTON: So we're recommending "no" on that?

LEE: Yes, that is our recommendation.

MOSS: And the 3-006 in the middle there we're recommending that that simply stay rural? Staff is recommending that?

LEE: Yes. It's currently a combination of Rural 10 and Ag-20 and the recommendation was to go to either light manufacturing or business park.

MOSS: It seems a little, it seems a little strange to me to leave that as is and then reach out there to the northeast and take the other property in as new urban reserve.

LEE: I think we in essence concurred with the Port of Ridgefield that it would make sense for them to do a master plan for their entire property. I think 35, no, 35 acres is outside the existing urban growth boundary in this area and I think they have 45 acres inside the urban growth boundary there.

MOSS: No, I'm talking about on the east side of 10th Avenue.

TOWNE: That's not urban reserve right now.

LEE: That is a -- that was proposed by both the City and by some individual property owners to be reserve and we are not recommending that it be reserve.

WRISTON: There were more than the church. I mean I see the Port property there, but I thought there were several landowners besides the church, that there were a couple other landowners.

LEE: I think there was a couple. The Port, there may be a couple of in holdings, if you will, within the Port, some additional lots within the Port area that -- and there was one or two people that did come to the meeting and indicated that they concurred with the Port's recommendation to bring that in.

WRISTON: And then the fire district was going to go somewhere?

LEE: Yes. I don't, I think -- I don't think they had a specific site but they were looking in this general vicinity as hopefully working with the Port to find a site.

WRISTON: And then what's that little dot below it that we're not bringing, that we're not recommending, that you're not recommending to bring in? It's just a small piece it looks like.

LEE: Oh, that's an ownership separate from the Port property.

WRISTON: No, actually on your zoning map you've got it in.

LEE: So perhaps we included that in the zoning, but the site-specific request was just specific to the Port boundaries.

WRISTON: So are we saying that parcel is coming in as well? Are you recommending that parcel come in as well?

LEE: Yes.

WRISTON: So it's a square parcel. So of that group that testified in that area, the church is the one that you're recommending not to come in?

LEE: Well, there's several. There's the church, there is the Boschma property.

WRISTON: Where's that again?

LEE: Just up in here. Okay. The only specific testimony we received was from the church and from the Port, sort of there was a comment from a couple of adjoining property owners to the Port property that expressed satisfaction with the Port's recommendation and I don't know that I have the names in front of me at this point.

WRISTON: Didn't the Port actually present a -- am I getting things confused? Didn't the Port actually present? I know the church presented a plan but --

LEE: I think the church and the Port had been talking, I think they suggested and I think it was actually the church property that showed sort of the illustrative of what their campus could look like up in this area, and the Port indicated that that sort of use would be consistent with the type of development that they might anticipate on their property in there and they would feel it would be a complimentary use.

WRISTON: I thought the Port also showed some sort of layout of --

MOSS: The entire --

WRISTON: -- the entire --

MOSS: -- area. Yeah, I thought they did also.

WRISTON: I can go digging through my box. But in any event, I guess one of my points to throw out for discussion is that that was intriguing about that particular request was that they owned the site. I mean we're talking about jobs and job growth I think, I can't remember. There was testimony from them that there was a fair amount of family wage, I

think he said 50,000 was what their wage was, and, you know, we're going around putting employment centers here and there and all, but this was one that --

MOSS: Had a specific proposal.

WRISTON: Well, yeah, it looked like one that actually, you know, we were talking at the work session about vacancy rates and things like that and this was one that actually looked like it might go relatively soon or be in the process and actually create some jobs and not have to wait for things to catch up and for the economy to get better and all the other things so. I guess that's one that, and I want to dig through my packet and try to find the specific testimony, but that's one thing I'd throw out.

LEE: Yes. That the -- I mean there was actually quite a history to the church site.

WRISTON: What's that?

LEE: That was James was laughing in the background. There's quite a history to the church site.

WRISTON: Why is that?

LEE: They had proposed a conditional use permit under the current rural zoning for to relocate their, basically their regional headquarters from Portland to the Ridgefield Junction area. It went through a Hearing's Examiner and the Hearing's Examiner denied the proposal in that the use was more of a business proposal as opposed to a church worship site proposal and so it was inappropriate for the rural zoning. So that's kind of the history of how this comes back to us now as a comprehensive plan amendment.

WRISTON: But it is a business proposal so, I mean, it's an employment proposal.

LEE: I'm just providing the background, Jeff.

WRISTON: No, I know. But I mean I'm saying that's -- I mean so I guess that's why I throw it out in that it is something that may actually bring jobs rather than pretty colors on a map. I mean that's something that may actually, may actually occur.

LEE: That's certainly within the purview of the Planning Commission to make that recommendation or other changes certainly to what the staff is recommending at this point.

DELEISSEGUES: I have the Ridgefield, Port of Ridgefield's September 25th, 2003 testimony that they have and their Port request summary was "Planning Commission recommend expansion of the Ridgefield UGA to include land within Ridgefield industrial urban reserve east of Interstate 5." So that was their request. As far as the church goes, I agree with Jeff, I think that's one we ought to take a hard look at. The jobs are ready to go,

it sounded like the land was fairly easily developable, the Port supported it, I'd certainly recommend it. Here, Jeff, I'll give you the testimony.

WRISTON: What did you do, put this all in --

LEIN: Any other questions of staff at this point? Would you like to invite the City of Ridgefield in for Monday night?

BARCA: I think we have some more discussion before we invite them in. I'd be interested in the aspect of where 10th Avenue hits Pioneer Road and then again at 259th. We have those two very small parcels, but I would consider it somewhat shortsighted on our part if we didn't look at the aspect of how we wanted that to grow and change in regard to all of the change that's going to happen around it. We've already got some commercial sites, we've got the old Pioneer Store, that parcel that we heard testimony on and is recommended to go towards a commercial site. Rural commercial I think is what the designation was. I think we should start looking at the aspect of between those two roads what that's going to look like and encompassing the full intersection of 259th and, but I'd like to hear some discussion on that as well.

LEE: I just want to, and we can backtrack, actually the current industrial urban reserve, if you want to follow me, would go, it would include all four of those larger parcels and then a couple of smaller parcels within that. So that is what the geographic boundaries that the Port of Ridgefield referred to in the testimony that you shared, Dick.

SMITH: It makes sense along Pioneer Road.

BARCA: We're going to have mixed use --

MOSS: Ron, getting back to your question, I think you've got a legitimate point here, and it's one that may apply there on the south end of Battle Ground along 503 also, and I'm not sure that the use of rural commercial right at the edge of the urban growth boundary is appropriate. You know, there are some, I guess I would rather see the urban growth boundary expanded to include those parcels and they be made commercial for a couple of reasons. One is that the rural commercial uses that would be a CR-1 zone, since it's not in a rural center are pretty limited. The other thing is that they would have to be served by septic systems rather than urban sewer and I'm not sure that that's appropriate either. You know, I frankly prefer that they can be served by sewer. You know, this obviously is a commercial area that needs to be provided for somehow. I think it was a mistake to not make that provision in the previous plan, so I'd like to see us do that, you know, even if it meant going to rural commercial, but my preference would be to make it part of the urban growth boundary and give it a rural commercial designation.

BARCA: I concur with that. I'd like to look, I guess, in that small area a lot closer from the Pioneer Road, 10th Avenue intersection going down to 259th and then talk about the

aspect that a tag of commercial property along that strip would be appropriate as we have already seen the mixed use designation promising to bring residential into the Union Ridge area. This allows Ridgefield an opportunity to start planning for services for that portion of their plan that's in existence and then the City would have an opportunity to respond to our thought process in that regard. I know that Ridgefield, and like some of the other municipalities, feels like once the acreage is designated within their urban growth boundary, they can choose how they want to designate it and this recommendation once we put it in is only a recommendation until they adopt it and then it becomes theirs. But I'm comfortable within the context of the no net loss policy whether it ends up being jobs or acreage that it will service the thought process that we're trying to get across anyway even if it doesn't turn out to be exactly what we put down in the way of colors on the map.

LEIN: I guess my concern on those two parcels from rural commercial to put them in the UGA make commercial is the physical size of them may not be big enough at this point to really create anything commercial there. The existing store parcel is very small and when you see the development that has been going on at the interchange you're going to be having those people compete with the interchange and I'm not sure that that justifies bringing that area along 10th into the UGA. I think this recognizes that existing uses there, but I think we heard from at least the gentleman on the east side that he doesn't anticipate, you know, he wanted to be able to be a commercial but he doesn't anticipate expansion or changing because he doesn't have much space to do that.

LEE: This, I think the graphic we just dug up, this is what at least the City had recommended be included as commercial. This is Pioneer, 10th Street here, 259th down here, we are recommending as rural commercial so I think we both recognize that there's commercial uses there and I think Vaughn has hit upon the question of what scale of commercial is appropriate for that area.

DELEISSEGUES: So where did we leave that? Are we going to invite Ridgefield on Monday too?

LEIN: Well, I think Ron had a point, I don't think any of us have addressed some of Ron's last question, the parcel between 10th and --

BARCA: Between Pioneer and 259th. At least I think trying to carve out a commercial designation in there would encompass both sides of the intersection at the Pioneer portion and then at least to the north side of 259th which would include the one site-specific request I believe which was three parcels to the east on 259th.

LEE: Is it letter 214?

BARCA: Yeah, that would be Number 214.

LEE: Yeah, that's a request to go from Ag-20 to light manufacturing.

BARCA: And my thought process is it could help anchor that commercial requirement.

LEIN: But it's going -- the request is for light industrial, not commercial.

BARCA: Yeah.

LEE: Evan, do you want to put up the one that I gave you.

DUST: Yeah.

LEE: Can you pick up in the I-5 area. Okay. That doesn't show very well. Is it the R-2 that's all commercial?

TOWNE: There's already existing.

DUST: Are you thinking about existing commercial in that area, Pat?

LEE: Yeah.

TOWNE: How do you do this?

LEE: The yellow button. Zap Evan.

TOWNE: We don't have a zoning map of this, but as many of you are probably aware this is all commercial and it's mostly developed now as commercial this entire area. And then if I believe, and I don't, you know, don't quote me on this, there's commercial that's going in in this area, in this large area that's the mixed use. The first thing that went in is the large distribution, but there will also be commercial development in here, and there could be a fair amount of it, so I just wanted to point that out if you're going to also create another large, well, maybe not as big, but it would be extensive if you're talking about all of that as also commercial, it might be something to consider.

BARCA: And in regard to that I guess my real concern is to take those two single parcels and turn them into rural commercial or to validate them as commercial and throw them into Ridgefield's urban growth boundary as two little islands of commercial. We're not doing anything towards planning for the future of that other than the fact of legitimizing those two individual parcels and I just think it's part of our charter to try and take those parcels, if we're going to make them commercial, we've got to try and give them some type of a future that's going to happen there, otherwise we're leaving it up to 10-year plan or something else before they're going to be able to be viable in some fashion.

TOWNE: I would -- can I answer, speak to that?

BARCA: You have the microphone.

TOWNE: Thank you, Ron. I would also suggest that Ridgefield has stated that it's difficult for them to even serve already the existing. They've extended a large amount that includes that large parcel with the distribution area and that the small parcels that you're speaking of, which we're recommending as rural commercial, are already developed and we've had testimony that they have no intention to expand. They would like to have rural commercial or commercial just so that they're legitimate instead of Ag. So we don't see a lot of future planning in that area until maybe the next round of planning.

WRISTON: We heard testimony I thought, and I thought it related to that area, kind of that whole, actually not just that rural commercial, where the circle is but the kind of whole strip that the City of Ridgefield, and I think this was the one, that the City of Ridgefield included that area in its recommendation for urban growth boundary expansion.

LEE: Yes, they have. I think this is the -- on this map basically they have included this --

WRISTON: And that's the purple then?

LEE: -- this and they are suggesting that that be urban reserve.

WRISTON: But you were --

LEE: Yes, they did suggest that this be brought into the urban growth boundary.

WRISTON: But you were just saying something about --

LEE: And their intent was to apply their employment mixed use designation in that area.

WRISTON: But you were saying something about services, that they can't, they're already saying they can't serve that area or did I mishear you?

DUST: For the record, I had communication today from Eric Eisemann who unfortunately was not able to be here and I didn't get my act together well enough to get Dean Hergesheimer, the consulting engineer for the City, here tonight but that communication from Eric intimated that Dean was prepared to testify about the adequacy of their capital facilities planning to the extent that their capital facilities planning would support their entire request inclusive of being able to serve the urban reserve areas.

WRISTON: So they no longer want that?

LEE: I think they're reinforcing that they want it and perhaps they've done some additional capital facilities planning based on this information. Probably the best thing to do would be to ask if we can get Mr. Hergesheimer here on Monday to speak to the issue.

MOSS: That would be good. Okay.

LEIN: Do we have questions of staff on other issues?

WRISTON: Black Jack Fireworks, is that in this area?

BARCA: No.

LEE: No. That is one of those 20 site-specific requests that you gave us earlier for direction on tonight.

WRISTON: That's right. Okay, that's right. No, I just came across their map and then I -- I've been doing very good, I'm pulling out all my --

BARCA: The right freeway though, Jeff, it's still it's I-5.

WRISTON: No, I know.

DELEISSEGUES: The right county.

WRISTON: No, I forgot, it is in that. I knew I saw it.

LEIN: Any other comments or questions of staff on Ridgefield? The idea is to invite someone from the City to come next week on Monday night.

BARCA: So as a group we're entertaining all of Ridgefield's requests at this point in time, that's where we've kind of left it off?

LEIN: I have not heard any kind of a straw vote whether we would be including either going with staff recommendation or going with the recommendation of the City of Ridgefield. I think the purpose of that is to get the Ridgefield people here.

WRISTON: And I guess I'd want to hear from Ridgefield some strong justifications why they want all that in and how that's -- and hear from you guys why, more specifically why or why not it would be justified. I mean it's -- their plan is to make all that employment center as well you said or --

LEE: Yeah, for a large part of that east of I-5 they were proposing, they had proposed in their prior testimony to employ the I think the mixed use employment designation that they I guess created over the last year.

WRISTON: Well, mixed use is different though. Mixed use allows, that allows a fairly --

LEE: Their mixed use, it does have a family wage job criterion but it also allows residential uses.

WRISTON: To what percentage?

LEE: I don't have the specifics on that.

WRISTON: Pretty high though?

LEE: Do you know the percentage of residential in the mixed use that's allowed in Ridgefield?

DUST: I believe the maximum residential is 20 percent and that it is focused on multi-family and it's tied -- you cannot bring in the 20 percent residential until you've achieved family wage jobs of an equivalent parcel size. So in the sense that if you're yielding family wage jobs at 20, 20 employees per acre, then as long as you get enough family wage jobs to produce enough acreage to offset the 20 percent residential that you'd like to bring in, that at that point you can bring the residential in. So it's a fairly restrictive ordinance.

BARCA: Can we get clarification on whether what you just said, Evan, is their current policy for all mixed use or was it exclusive to the Union Ridge development. And if that's going to be their policy have the City bring that forward, please.

LEE: My understanding it's a new designation that they created, but we could see if their intent is to restrict it to Union Ridge or to use it elsewhere. I believe it is what has been proposed at least for the Boschma site.

BARCA: And when Ridgefield comes, it would be nice to see what their proposal for this number of acres is and what type of designation they propose for it to come in as.

LEE: Actually in your various testimony you have sort of an analysis done by Larry Wilson that did provide that information, but certainly we can have the City present it to you.

BARCA: They've been known to change their mind.

LEE: Yes, that is true.

LEIN: Anything --

WRISTON: Here's the map. I knew I wasn't crazy.

LEIN: We won't vote.

LEE: The Black Jack Fireworks?

WRISTON: No, the Port of Ridgefield map and with the parcel layouts. And I, they show, you know, they show business park, light industrial sites, wildlife, wetland and they've kind of planned it out. I mean it's rough, but I don't know if you guys remember this, those are all of those parcels put together I think because they show the church, you know, that's the church up there so. That's business park, light industrial. And I don't know if anyone wants to see it, but that's what they recommended.

BARCA: And that's all part of existing industrial urban reserve?

WRISTON: Right.

LEE: Yes, it is.

MOSS: It's that whole quadrant up there.

WRISTON: It's that whole --

BARCA: Right. Unlike some of the other parcels.

WRISTON: Right. 3-069, what was the justification on that? While I was going through this you probably already said it but --

SMITH: School.

MOSS: School.

LEE: Yes, that is the proposed new Ridgefield High School. I think we had a discussion about the middle school earlier. If they build that high school, the existing high school will be converted to the middle school.

MOSS: What's the advantage of having the school in the urban growth boundary?

LEE: Sewering would be the primary advantage, plus I think it also tacitly recognizes the traffic generation that would result from a high school site.

MOSS: I'm sorry, what was the last part of that?

LEE: Traffic generation that would result from a high school site. Actually high schools are some very high traffic generators and so it probably would allow employment of urban road standards.

RUPLEY: And fast traffic.

WRISTON: That area you're bringing in as employment center and what was the justification on that again just for my own --

LEE: With the light blue on the --

WRISTON: Just the little, yeah, I mean it's just a little --

LEE: I believe that was adjacent to the Pioneer Street, at the proposed Pioneer Street extension, and the idea was to allow urban uses on both sides of Pioneer Street.

LEIN: Any other questions on Ridgefield? We will certainly invite the City.

WRISTON: We got Ridgefield now coming?

LEIN: Yeah. Let's go on to Battle Ground.

LEE: Dennis Osborn is here from the City, but let me give you a brief introduction and certainly Dennis would like to comment. Based on the transportation analysis that we had done on the proposed plan, we were seeing significant strain in the north/south system between the Battle Ground and the Vancouver urban growth areas. One response to that, certainly not the only response, but one that we have taken a look at and are recommended at this time, as staff would be to in essence remove I think approximately 2700 units from the Battle Ground urban growth boundary expansion area because of the traffic demands that it causes on the north/south system and relocate those elsewhere. So the proposal for the Battle Ground is significantly smaller than what we had originally proposed as County staff which was still smaller than what Battle Ground had proposed as the City as their preferred land use.

What we have done for Battle Ground is we've looked at the Meadow Glade sewer district boundary and basically used that as an area of urban growth incorporation and then, why don't you go to the zoning map, we, this, basically this entire strip that is now outside of the proposed urban growth boundary, I believe including some parcels up here, those are the areas that we primarily have removed, are proposing to remove, as well as a couple of parcels here and here. We have also converted this from a residential piece to an employment piece again as an effort to try and maintain some critical mass of employment in Battle Ground to help balance out the transportation system, and we have adjusted some of the boundaries of the proposed employment uses down through these areas.

So those are the basic changes that we have made, at least staff is recommending at this time, in order to address that transportation issue that we have had. And there are numerous site-specific requests all along the urban growth boundary and I'm certainly happy to address those if you'd like, but it might be timely to have Dennis speak on the City's reaction. I just had the opportunity to talk with Dennis and review this map last

Friday so he hasn't had a lot of time to confer with his Council, et cetera, but I do believe he would like to make a comment at this point.

LEIN: Mr. Osborn.

OSBORN: I'm Dennis Osborn, Planning Director the City of Battle Ground. We would like to take a brief moment and thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment tonight, especially will not be able to be here Monday night since it's a scheduled Council meeting that night. As Pat indicated, we just received a copy of this on Friday so we haven't had a chance to really digest it or even go over the numbers and what the implications may mean. I received an E-mail from the County this afternoon showing some of the numbers as far as it relates to acreage I believe and jobs and things of that nature.

What Battle Ground's concern is is that the alternative that the Commission took to public hearing and had discussions on is not what you're deliberating on this evening. The property owners that were affected from the proposal that went to the final EIS that you took to, what, several public hearings on and took testimony on, that's not what you're deliberating this evening and so we have a concern about that. We have a concern about the fact that you went through that public hearing process on a different urban growth boundary than what you're looking at this evening, and I believe your legal counsel would probably tell you that there's the opportunity to comment on this when the County Commissioners have it before them, but my guess is that if all of the property owners that were removed from this urban growth boundary knew about it, I would suspect several of them would be here this evening. I don't think that they're even aware that this is occurring and yet you're faced with a deliberation tonight of whether to accept or recommend to the County Commissioners this proposed boundary.

I guess what it sort of boils down to is when this proposal came forward to the City, it was presented to us that the capital facilities plan, it really can't be funded, primarily the transportation component. And what we're concerned about is that we haven't had the opportunity to prepare a CFP, a formal CFP, that complies with State law to make that determination as to whether or not this boundary, and the boundary I'm talking about is the boundary that went to the final EIS on, would be supported through a capital facilities plan. And I guess I would recommend as an option for the Planning Commission to consider is to hold off on establishing the final urban growth boundaries for possibly another six months and let us develop our capital facilities plan, submit those to you, and pursuant to State statute if it shows that we can fund the improvements, then we've satisfied that criteria. If it shows we can't, pursuant to State statute we have to modify the funding sources or look at reassessing some of the land use assumptions which may include reduction of the proposed urban growth boundary. But procedurally we'd, I guess, just from the fundamental standpoint it just seems a little awkward that there were several public hearings, there was testimony provided by myself, by the mayor, by citizens of the Battle Ground area, and now tonight it's a bit of a different boundary that you're deliberating on. And in summary that's just our concerns.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Osborn? I guess you haven't really had a chance, then, to look at the changes sufficiently enough, you've commented more on generalities than specifics?

OSBORN: That's correct. And I haven't even had a chance to present this to Council. I hope to give a quick overview on that this coming Monday.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Mr. Lee.

LEE: I would just say certainly you recognize the City's, what they had recommended is quite different. From a procedural standpoint, and if you would like Mr. Lowry to comment, I'm sure that he would be able to, but it's our belief that given the difficulties we had with transportation between the Battle Ground and Vancouver urban growth boundaries, we had little recourse but to reevaluate what land uses could be accommodated pursuant to the provisions of the Growth Management Act. So procedurally I don't think there is a difficulty. And certainly whether it's this proposal or the City's original proposal or some other proposal that the Planning Commission ultimately feels is the best 20-year plan for Battle Ground, that is certainly within your purview to deliberate and make a recommendation on it. So you're not constrained certainly to what staff is recommending, but we felt it was pretty incumbent upon us to reevaluate the land use based on the capital facilities analysis.

LEIN: Questions of staff?

BARCA: I have a question. As we've been trying to continually be cognizant of the jobs/housing ratio in this scaled-down version, how does that play out with Battle Ground in the relationship to job/housing ratio? Was that proportionality maintained? Was the number of jobs perhaps increased in the ratio? How did you come up with these choices?

LEE: We believe we've held the same ratio, jobs/housing ratio in the proposed, proposals before you today as was in the prior proposal.

BARCA: So proportionality remains the same or does the actual numbers remain the same?

ALVAREZ: The amount of acreage, Jose Alvarez, Clark County, the amount of acreage is constant between the initial proposal and the current proposal in terms of residential and job producing lands.

BARCA: So on a proportionality basis it remains the same?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Other comments?

MOSS: I have some. I have a number of questions. I can start it anywhere. Could we start with Meadow Glade. I recall that back in '94 the County's original plan was to leave Meadow Glade as rural. It seemed like it was only toward the end of the process that the issue of funding of the Meadow Glade sewer system came up, and as I recall there was a financial problem in that there was a rather large loan that was to be repaid by hookups to the Meadow Glade sewer system that I believe it was from an EPA loan or something like that. I'm curious to know what the status of that is right now, whether that's been repaid.

And the reason that I'm wondering about that is that it kind of relates to another question of mine and that's that I, the system that exists out there right now is a STEP system, a septic tank effluent pumping system that's suitable for the one acre rural lots that exist in that Meadow Glade area, but I doubt that that would be appropriate for smaller lots. There is no gravity system out there at all, it's all pressure system, and it's one that only pumps effluent, the solids remain in septic tanks on the lots, which as I said is kind of maybe appropriate for one-acre lots but probably not for 6,000-square foot lots.

So I'm wondering on the one hand has any real thought been given to how a new urban growth area or new urban zoning would be handled for sewer. And given also that this rezoning would probably result in no more additions to the current pressurized system, what would happen with repayment of that loan or is it already repaid?

LEE: We have not addressed that, but we can try and get some information and report back to you on that.

MOSS: I have some questions up there to the north. The property that's been designated up there at 239th Street, and I believe that's Battle Ground's now, I have forgotten, is it 12th Avenue, it used to be 112th Street, the green one up there, yeah, just to the left, right there, that's designated as public facilities, the whole 40 acres, but it seems to me that Battle Ground School District only bought the north half of that and that the south half of that remains in private hands and there's no intent to develop that as a public facility?

LEE: Our understanding from the school district is that they -- I don't know if they've completed purchase of the site, but they intend to utilize the entire site.

MOSS: I think they have completed it unless things have changed. I did a feasibility study for the school district on this and their intent at that time was only to buy the north half and that the south half would be developed as residential. So that's something I think that needs to be clarified.

LEE: Okay, we'll talk to the school district about that.

MOSS: Okay. Also the parcel to the west of that, that Waldal property, that's designated I guess that's, is that employment center?

DUST: Yes.

LEE: Yes, it is.

MOSS: I'm trying to remember what the proposed use of that was. Was that light industrial?

LEE: Is it this property?

LEE: Now I'm not sure that there is an exact congruence of the City zoning and the County zoning, but I believe that is recommended as a business park type parcel from the City.

MOSS: I guess I'm wondering whether that's an appropriate zoning next to that K-7 school facility?

LEE: Dennis, do you, is that one of the employment mixed use?

OSBORN: Yeah. I think it's a mixed use parcel, yes.

LEE: Mixed use employment. Did you want to briefly describe kind of what the City's intent is there.

OSBORN: And, I'm sorry, the question again, please.

MOSS: I'm asking about the parcel, the blue colored parcel up there, that would be next to the new K-8 school facility.

OSBORN: How and why it was designated as such?

MOSS: Yes. And what the intended or the proposed use of that is?

OSBORN: It would be a commercial office space, yes.

MOSS: I know there was a specific request I think from the landowner on that one for was it residential?

OSBORN: I didn't come prepared with data tonight, I wasn't sure if I'd have the opportunity to testify, so that may be if that's what your records are showing.

LEE: Site-specific requests, we have some site-specific requests I think along that tier and

we have 3-082. If you look at the site-specific request map, 3-082, 3-067 and 3-090 and can you, they're all 2003-82, no, 67, 82 and 90. The property owner had suggested Ag-20 to R1-7.5, urban low density residential, and in the proposed plan it was shown as BP, the proposed County plan it was shown as BP. So it's one of those situations where the property was brought into the urban growth boundary, but proposed for a different designation than what the property owner had requested.

MOSS: Okay. But there's -- I guess the reason I was wondering about that is 3-082 says "yes" on it but --

LEE: And again, the "yes" means it was to bring it into the urban growth boundary. Yes, we brought it into the urban growth boundary, but that doesn't mean we've brought it into the same designation that the property owner had requested. Do you want to do 067, 3-067?

ORJIAKO: That's Battle Ground School District.

LEE: The size of the parcel. Yeah, that's 39.5, so I do believe it's the entire parcel that's proposed by the Battle Ground School District.

MOSS: Well, when did the proposal come in?

LEE: Pardon me?

MOSS: When did the proposal come in?

LEE: I don't have the specific date. It was this year sometime.

MOSS: The reason I'm asking about that is that the parcel was a roughly 40-acre parcel and hadn't been split, but I think it's worth checking on. I don't believe that the school district intends to develop all of that.

LEE: Okay, we can check. And then you had -- immediately adjacent to that you had 3-090, which would be this parcel right here, and they wanted to go from urban reserve 20 to urban medium or urban reserve 10 to urban medium.

WRISTON: And you're going R1-6?

LEE: Yes, we have gone to R1-6 in our proposal.

LEIN: Do we have additional comments?

WRISTON: But the parks, we already talked about that? What's up with the, a lot of parks?

LEE: This is the Tukes Mountain area.

WRISTON: Oh, okay. The three are?

LEE: Pardon me?

WRISTON: The three; right?

LEE: Yeah. And this is Battle Ground's proposing that as a park site.

WRISTON: Do they own it or do they just --

LEE: Yeah. Yeah, they do.

WRISTON: And then where is Windsong or is it Whispering Pines?

MOSS: Windsong is that 3-022.

LEE: Yeah. And there is -- and down in, down in this area and I think their request of Mr. Lear is for this portion to be commercial. Am I correct there?

WRISTON: Yeah, he wanted highway commercial, 6 acres.

LEE: He wanted commercial there and the rest is their residential.

WRISTON: So we're saying no on the commercial?

LEE: At this point we are recommending the residential for the entire property. I believe there is another proposal, there is a currently -- I think this gets back to an issue that Lonnie might have mentioned before. I believe this is currently a rural commercial site that --

MOSS: That's sandwiched in there.

LEE: -- is suggested to be -- I think Ms. Bremer was suggesting to bring this in as a highway commercial site, urban highway commercial site, which we at this point have recommended retaining that as a rural commercial, but it's the same issue that we were discussing earlier.

MOSS: Yeah, I'd like to -- go ahead.

WRISTON: No, I was going to say but on the Lear, but on the Lear one I understand that's a different one, but on Lear we have "yes" but part of it we're saying "no."

LEE: Because it's, I believe it's currently outside the urban growth boundary; is that correct?

BARCA: Yeah.

MOSS: That's correct.

LEE: Yeah. And so it's "yes" because we're bringing it back, we're bringing it into the urban growth boundary. I think he is -- the Lears are okay with the residential except for the portion right along 503 that they want commercial.

WRISTON: Right. Yeah. But I just wanted to -- and we're saying, you're asking, you're saying that that should be commercial or residential?

LEE: We are, yes --

WRISTON: Keeping that residential?

LEE: -- recommending residential at this point. We've had testimony from both sides of that discussion.

WRISTON: Right. No, I remember it.

SMITH: There's a small site-specific request in the middle of the Meadow Glade area, it's 1-057, it doesn't have a recommendation.

LEE: Well, what was the proposal on 1-057? He wanted to go from rural center residential one-acre lot to rural center commercial CR-2, that was the proposal for that one in the middle of Meadow Glade.

SMITH: And there's no recommendation on there. Is it a "yes" or a "no"?

LEE: We incorporated Meadow Glade as a residential.

SMITH: So you didn't have to --

LEE: Yes.

SMITH: That's a "yes"?

LEE: It's "yes" because it's from outside the urban growth boundary, inside the urban growth boundary it is not consistent with the designation recommended on the site-specific request.

WRISTON: Is there any reason for it to be? I mean it doesn't --

LEE: Well, I think --

WRISTON: The rationale for it.

LEE: -- you know, depending on what you recommend on how to treat Meadow Glade, keep it a rural center, bring it into the urban growth boundary, you may want to have some discussion about it.

WRISTON: What about 1-061, what is that one?

LEE: Rural center residential one-acre lot and rural center residential 2.5 acre lot and rural 5 acre lot to urban low density residential R1-6.

WRISTON: That's the request?

LEE: That is the request from the property owner.

WRISTON: And we're putting employment center, recommending, you're -- staff is recommending employment center?

LEE: They also wanted some commercial use there as well, but, yes, we are recommending that as employment.

WRISTON: Do they own all three parcels? They must.

ORJIAKO: I will say I would think so. Yes, under one name.

LEE: Randy is the agent for those properties I believe. Or at least his name is on our chart as the agent for those properties.

WRISTON: What's the name?

ORJIAKO: We have it down as Property Investments Association.

PRINTZ: Which properties?

LEE: Meadow Glade.

PRINTZ: Oh, yeah.

WRISTON: Property Investments?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

WRISTON: Was there testimony on that?

ORJIAKO: No. Under name and Randy Printz as their representative.

WRISTON: Okay. But no testimony by Randy?

LEE: I don't know. Did you submit one of your written testimony pieces on that?

WRISTON: But not --

LEE: So he did, yes.

WRISTON: Right, written. I'm trying to grab all, look at the written stuff and look at my notes at the same time.

PRINTZ: Vaughn was keeping me to a five minute timeline.

LEIN: Yeah, that will be the day.

WRISTON: And then if you already -- and you may have already covered it when I was riffing through notes, but 3-086 there's like four of them, five of them.

LEE: I think it is the proposal was to go from rural 5 and rural 10 to urban low density residential 1.6 and we are not recommending that it be brought into the urban growth boundary.

WRISTON: On the bottom?

LEE: 3-086?

WRISTON: Yeah. Well, there's a bunch of them.

LEIN: Four of them were within the boundary.

WRISTON: Four of them were in and one looks like it's out.

LEE: Okay. Yeah, there is one. The one that's furthest south is we're recommending that it is out of the boundary. And there are two others --

MOSS: Four others.

LEE: -- four others --

WRISTON: It looks like we're recommending that some of them be industrial and --

LEE: I think some of the requests were for industrial.

WRISTON: Some industrial and some R1-7.5 and R-15, OR-15.

LEE: Actually you're right, that was proposed by the property owners as low density residential and we have recommended making it employment. And that was I think one that Battle Ground had recommended be a mixed use residential, which is a combination of some commercial and some residential.

WRISTON: So where we put industrial on those two, they asked for low residential?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEE: It is contiguous to the existing Battle Ground industrial and it's along the railroad track.

WRISTON: Okay, that helps. That's, it's hard, you can't tell that from -- that helps.

BARCA: Excuse me, could I get you to put up this map that goes back. This is the September 19th map, but it's that bottom section, I think it might help clarify for Jeff and get us kind of on the same page. Well, let's deal with the portion along the railroad track first, I think that was initially Jeff's question. And the designation on that according to that map which was the City's proposal was residential and then to the west of it was a mixed use designation.

WRISTON: Are you telling that by the colors?

BARCA: Pardon?

WRISTON: You're telling that or do the colors tell you that?

BARCA: Well, yes, they do.

LEE: Actually the perimeter of the parcels on the aerials we did try to reflect the color, that would be consistent with the land use designation, but it doesn't show up very well on the projector here.

WRISTON: I've got this map.

BARCA: Of course you do. So the reasoning behind the County's proposal is the land that

was adjacent to the railroad track became industrial and the reasoning for the other residential property is that a mixed use within the city's boundary is of their concern but you want to make sure that the --

LEE: You want to put up the zoning map.

BARCA: Pardon?

LEE: So here is the industrial next to the railroad tracks, here is some of the other parcels in that cluster. This one is office residential 15 which is we believe was consistent with what Battle Ground was recommending for the property and this is the R1-7.5 down here. So you have industrial, office, residential and single-family residential is our recommendation.

BARCA: So the R1-7.5 I guess is the part that I was referring to that was considered mixed use in the City's proposal, but we have a designation change to the residential exclusively and I was wondering was there a particular reason?

LEE: Can you tell the perimeter whether that was a mixed use in fact, the color of the perimeter on the arrow?

DUST: That's correct.

LEE: Was it a mixed use residential or what?

DUST: It just says "mixed use."

LEE: Battle Ground had a or has in their proposal suggested a mixed use residential and a mixed use employment, this was a mixed use residential. Dennis would have to explain to you the difference between the two. That's all right, if Ron wants clarification I'm sure he'll ask you.

BARCA: Or I was just actually wondering why the County made the change, and I think what you're telling me as far as your explanation, and if I get it wrong, tell me that it's not correct, but you're saying that a portion of what is designated up there mixed use you assigned to office residential, so pushing towards the higher end of employment over residential, and then on the bottom half of that change, you made it more of a residential component without a characterization of any job creation in there?

LEE: That is correct. Because we felt that was the closest approximation that we could make to what Battle Ground had recommended.

BARCA: Okay. Because of these changes, and I think for the sake of the City's understanding what they're receiving, is it possible when we meet next time that for each of

the cities we can see where there is additions of land, the acreage that's grown, the number of people that you anticipated accommodating and the number of jobs that you anticipated accommodating? Is that possible?

LEE: Certainly we can provide you with what the County assumptions were, the City's assumptions could vary from the County's assumptions.

BARCA: And I would only expect the County's assumptions.

LEE: So you wanted -- for the additions of land you wanted?

BARCA: The anticipated additional residential capacity and the additional job growth capacity within those designations.

LEE: We will try and get you that information. It will be admittedly rough, but we will try and get you that. We assessed capacity based on some fairly broad assumptions so in any individual parcel they could vary from what the generalized assumptions are.

BARCA: And I think that would help us also in the aspect of whether we generally can concur with those assumptions or whether as a group we feel that there's problems.

LEIN: Lonnie, you had some --

LEE: Why don't you put that up there. Dennis has -- since Dennis won't be able to be with us on Monday, he did quickly sketch out showing what the changes and recommendation. Where he's handwritten in you have what we have removed from the boundary and what the designations were, R being residential; OR, office residential; high industrial; MU, mixed use, so those are, that's where we found the 2700 units.

MOSS: What 2700 units?

LEE: That is what we reallocated on the residential from the urban growth, proposed urban growth expansion area from Battle Ground, they're relocated elsewhere.

MOSS: I thought you had one of those areas up there in the northeast, one of those top two Rs, the one to the west --

LEE: Yes.

MOSS: -- okay, that one right there. It seems like that's an odd one to excise out of the proposed urban growth boundary because it leaves that as a peninsula surrounded on both three sides by urban growth boundary and it's got direct access to 142nd Avenue there, it's got development, a subdivision to the east of it.

LEE: Right. I think there is two, there's two reasons why we identified that area. One I think, and do you have the aerial, it might help us, I think that whole, that whole tier, those three pieces across are actually quite wet which might account for the configuration of the subdivision in the middle parcel. And I'm not sure, I'm trying to see what the, if the aerial shows us what the land use is in that one parcel.

MOSS: It's currently undeveloped on all --

LEE: Okay, it is undeveloped.

MOSS: -- eight of those parcels and while it's, you know, there's some wet spots in there, but it isn't all wetland by any means.

LEE: Yeah, we were identifying -- as I said, we were identifying that area as to remove some residential from urban growth boundary expansion.

MOSS: Yeah, it seems as though -- I think that's Bloomquist property if I recall correctly, but it seems as though if you're going to make some changes someplace, that's an obvious one to leave in the urban growth boundary.

LEE: Again, what we were trying to accomplish was sort of a threshold of residential reduction that would help us on the capital facilities side, that was the primary driver, so at some point you are adding back some residential, that balance that we've tried to strike might be lost and it might need the larger improvement along some of the north/south corridors that we've discussed. But that's just background, certainly the Commission has the ability to make that recommendation.

LEIN: What other questions do you have on Battle Ground? Dick.

DELEISSEGUES: Not exactly a question but just a comment. Conceptually I certainly agree with what the staff is doing, I think that Battle Ground's got significant problems with what they're trying to deal with right now and the growth that they've had in the past. I'm not sure that they can handle really the growth that they came in with in their request and I think staff is right on target in trying to minimize the problems that are probably going to occur with the infrastructure costs. It seems like there's not only infrastructure as concerning new development and new infrastructure required to support it, but also the maintenance of the existing infrastructure in Battle Ground which has had a history of significant problems with water supply, certainly the roads.

The other concern that I've got is both Meadow Glade and Cedars, when we were on the rural task force there was significant local concern I guess in Meadow Glade about not only becoming a rural center but staying a rural center and I think that Battle Ground may have a problem in annexing that area if it requires a vote of the citizens, if you left it up to them I don't think they would go along with that just from what I heard during the testimony on the

rural center task force. And of course Cedars is another case in point. So some of the expansion that's shown to the south is in my mind problematical.

LEE: In drafting some of these boundaries one of the issues that we tried to keep in mind or one of the GMA policies that we tried to keep in mind was bringing in areas also already committed to more intensive development into urban growth areas which I think whether it's an urban density or not it's certainly Meadow Glade and the Cedars are certainly at a higher density of development than most rural areas and so we did try to follow that. And, you know, recognizing that, you know, we are departing in our recommendation significantly from the Battle Ground 50 year vision, they did point to Meadow Glade as a long-term portion of the city.

RUPLEY: Mr. Chair, I have one question too. I've been pretty persistent with Mr. Osborn asking him if he's met with the school district and I thought I'd give him a chance to come up and give us another round at it.

OSBORN: Dennis Osborn, the City of Battle Ground.

RUPLEY: I didn't do that.

OSBORN: Wow. Yes, we have. I met with the Vice Superintendent of the Battle Ground School District, Lynn Hicks, today, along with our facilities planner, and we met for about an hour talking about the school district's concerns and their numbers that they are facing for growth and we have another meeting scheduled for December 4th I believe to discuss how to bring the school along with the growth that we anticipate in Battle Ground. I think they raised some good points. I think we raised some good points. And I think there's a -- through that process of give and take I think we'll get to a point where I think the school district will be happy.

RUPLEY: I think one of the things that I would like you to consider as you have your meeting with Council next week and as we look you have -- it's my information that there's probably the equivalent of two schools of unhoused students and what we have here is one K-8 designated for the plan so.

OSBORN: I want to -- I was going to hold off but I'll go ahead and throw some numbers out. Lynn was at our County, or I'm sorry, our City Planning Commission meeting last night when I was giving them an update, the Planning Commission update, as to where we are in the GMA process and Lynn testified that they are anticipating from now to the year 2023 just under 6,000 new students I believe for the Battle Ground School District, but the interesting number was that about 49 percent of that growth is out in the county, 51 percent in the city, and I took that opportunity to point out to my Planning Commission that that is not the road problems, the infrastructure problems, the transportation problems and the loading up at the school is not solely the City of Battle Ground's problem, that school district goes well beyond that city limit, and you've heard me testify to that before, and I find it

interesting that when GMA intends for the growth to occur within urban areas, not rural areas, here's a school district where their growth over a 20-year period is going to equal that of what's occurring in the city limits.

So those 3,000 students that are going to be growing out in the rural area coming into the Battle Ground School District are going to be loading up our streets, our roads, our systems and I would say what's the County or the school district going to do to help us. You know, so it's not just Battle Ground creating this problem. I think the County should also take a look at the designations and the uses out in the rural area because I think ideally if you look at the spirit of the Growth Management Act, the majority of that growth should occur within that urbanized area and that it should be closer to 70 or 80 percent of that growth of the Battle Ground School District those students should be (inaudible) within the city limits, not out in the rural areas, but it's setting right about 50/50.

RUPLEY: And I think you have a pretty unique situation in the terms of Yacolt and Amboy being so far out. I mean if we look at it, it's a very unique situation statewide, transportation they've got lots of issues to deal with. And remember they are Battle Ground's future citizens --

OSBORN: Oh, definitely.

RUPLEY: -- as well as Clark County's and I probably think that somewhere along in the designation in both areas we need to look at more than one elementary school to house those 5700 students somewhere.

OSBORN: Definitely.

RUPLEY: Okay, thank you. And thanks for meeting with them too.

MOSS: Just a follow-up comment. I think it's worthwhile to keep this in perspective and that's that geographically Battle Ground is just about the center of the county. We have a lot of Battle Ground School District north of Battle Ground and it's probably somewhat unrealistic to believe that the population growth is not going to occur out there, you know, at some significant rate compared to that in Battle Ground.

RUPLEY: I agree.

LEIN: Other concerns or questions with respect to Battle Ground? Ron.

BARCA: I would like to have us engage in some discussion about the aspect of Meadow Glade. Dick has brought up a good point and Lonnie earlier brought up a good point in regard to Meadow Glade. We have some designations here that have been proposed that show employment centers. I believe that's also an industrial. Is that correct? Yes, thank you, Evan. And I'm interested in the aspect of knowing that area to a certain extent get

some other viewpoints on how realistic we think that is that those particular parcels or that region is going to develop or possibly develop according to this plan as opposed to some other perhaps geographic locations along the boundaries of Battle Ground.

You pointed out the aspect of the sewer and I guess what I'm wondering in that regard is what is it really going to take to allow these employment centers to develop with the constraints of the sewer system as they stand now. Are we talking about a capital effort that would be equivalent to rural property in general because the limitations are there, it isn't -- so it's not an upgrade of an urban facility to a greater extent, but it would be more like breaking new ground. I don't know the details of something like that well enough to understand what it is that we're really setting in place when we put these types of designations down in that part of the city limits.

MOSS: I actually I don't know either. You know, I think it's a question that needs to be addressed and that's why I suggested it. I don't want to imply, though, that I think that it's inappropriate for Meadow Glade to be taken into the urban growth boundary. As a matter of fact I don't, you know, I think were it not for the intensity of development that's already occurred there and the fact that we had that urban, excuse me, the STEP system out there probably shouldn't even be a rural center, you know, it has really no commercial area or anything like that, historically it hasn't provided the kind of rural services that most other rural centers have, but I do think that it's appropriate, you know, it's just kind of a small lot development out in the rural area and I think it is appropriate to take it into Battle Ground's urban growth boundary and make it urban, I'm just a little concerned about have we, you know, thought about how that's going to happen.

LEIN: You mean services-wise?

MOSS: Yeah.

BARCA: And in regard to that, I guess, then, I would like to have us reconsider the aspect of the one parcel that's 1-057 and their request to go commercial right there in the heart of Meadow Glade. We've had discussion before when we talked about it being a rural center the aspect that designating some commercial off of the 503 for that residential component was probably appropriate and I would like us to give a secondary consideration to having some designation along that Meadow Glade historical center, get some potential commercial working with it, maybe something that intersects along 20th or something of that nature.

WRISTON: How big of a parcel is that? It looks tiny.

SMITH: Maybe two acres.

BARCA: It looks tiny.

WRISTON: I bet the line eats up most of it.

BARCA: It's bigger on Evan's map if you take a look there.

WRISTON: It's a little late for those mind games.

BARCA: For you, yes.

LEE: 2.2 acres.

BARCA: There you go. The thickness of a line, Jeff. And I'm not saying that it has to be the exclusive piece of commercial property designated.

WRISTON: No. I mean that was my question. I mean there's 2.2 acres, it doesn't really accomplish what --

LEE: I think before deciding on the appropriate land use you may want to decide on where Meadow Glade fits into the picture and then decide on the appropriate land use after that.

MOSS: Yeah. I know we got to take this one step at a time, but, Ron, I do support what you've said and I think we need to have some community commercial out there to serve that area. And that was the thought at least when this was going to be a rural center and there's certainly going to be no less need for commercial.

LEE: 2.2 acres won't get you community commercial.

MOSS: No, it won't.

BARCA: Not by itself.

LEIN: Other conversations or desires of the Commission?

MOSS: Yeah, I want to make one more pitch for that little piece of rural commercial that's sandwiched in there between old Highway 503 and the new Highway 503 there at 179th Street.

LEE: Letter Number 14.

MOSS: Number 14, yeah. I think that's already approved, I think, for a convenience store and service station and I think it would be appropriate to get that thing on sewer. So I guess my recommendation would be that we draw the urban growth boundary to include that and also give it a commercial designation, probably highway commercial.

BARCA: So, Lonnie, just for my clarification and an understanding, staff recommendation

to hold residential on the west side of --

LEE: This is the parcel that Lonnie is speaking to.

BARCA: -- the west side of the 503 --

MOSS: And Windsong Acres.

BARCA: -- and Windsong Acres, you're not asking for a change of that, you're only asking for the inclusion of the little wedged parcel that's currently shown outside of the urban growth boundary?

MOSS: That's right. And that's currently zoned rural commercial.

WRISTON: So I guess I'd say, I mean, it right there on SR-503 you got commercial on one side of the street, we might consider that that Windsong request isn't so unreasonable to have commercial on the other side of the street as well, highway commercial.

BARCA: It would be if you lived there.

MOSS: No, that's -- the plan there in the arterial atlas is to have that 179th Street extend --

WRISTON: Right through there; right?

MOSS: -- all the way through there.

WRISTON: 120th, oh, yeah.

MOSS: So, yeah, it says 120th on something that we've got here but that's incorrect.

WRISTON: It shows two extensions on this. On the Lears it shows a proposed 120th going up --

MOSS: Right.

WRISTON: -- and connect to 120th and then 179th going up that way. So it's going to be according to them, on the piece that they're talking about, it's going to be bordered by SR-503 and NE 120th Avenue and NE 179th and I'm not sure who it -- and then it's also to the south bordered it looked like maybe by already preexisting highway commercial.

MOSS: Yeah, that intersection is the north entrance to Brush Prairie from Battle Ground also, and going to the west that's the piece that I mentioned is on the arterial atlas for extension all the way to the west to go over and connect into to Cramer Road and 102nd.

WRISTON: So I guess what I would say, though, in comment to Ron when he said it would be objectionable if you lived there, this parcel is going to be surrounded by either commercial or roads; right? I mean according to this. I don't know. Someone's got --

LEE: That's the extension that Lonnie was talking about.

DUST: That's the current extension that is shown on the arterial atlas. Certainly with subsequent to plan adoption we would be working with the City of Battle Ground if this came into the Battle Ground urban growth area to reevaluate the transportation system and to see what the City of Battle Ground was interested in constructing in terms of arterial system.

MOSS: Just for the record, I've talked with that owner of the property to the northwest of that intersection and he also is interested in having a piece of commercial on that corner.

DUST: Up here?

MOSS: Uh-huh.

DUST: That doesn't show up.

WRISTON: Where on this?

MOSS: Right there.

LEIN: How many other comments or questions do we have? What's the feeling of the Planning Commission, are we going to finish Battle Ground tonight?

BARCA: Finish?

LEIN: Just asking, don't need to get violent.

DELEISSEGUES: I just wonder if someone from Battle Ground can be here to discuss this on Monday if the director cannot be.

LEIN: Well, Dennis has a Council meeting.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I understand that, but I just wonder if someone else in the staff could come.

LEIN: Is there anybody else, Dennis?

OSBORN: I could ask our Development Services manger to attend.

LEIN: Any other questions of staff that they can do any research on?

WRISTON: Well, with Battle Ground, what we heard tonight anyway, I mean we've heard from Battle Ground, you know, we've heard from staff, but what Battle Ground is saying is they haven't had time to digest this is what I heard them say basically.

LEE: Yeah, I think Dennis mentioned he was hoping to brief his Council on it tomorrow. I mean not tomorrow, tomorrow or Monday. Monday.

WRISTON: So what is going to change between now and our hearing Monday? He's going to brief the Council Monday, and then he also talked about having the chance to prove that they can apply it to the capital facilities they need.

LEE: Well, I think, and I don't want to put words in Dennis' mouth and please correct me, but I think the current schedule for Battle Ground is to have a draft capital facilities plan for the city limits and whatever the urban growth boundary is by I think it was April --

OSBORN: 15th.

LEE: -- 15th, so that is the time frame in which they'd be able to do sort of the more complete capital facilities analysis of the urban growth boundary expansion, so I don't know if he's going to be in a position to respond to that on Monday.

WRISTON: Right. So that doesn't do us any good. I mean, you know, I mean we don't have the option to wait until April.

LEE: I mentioned this to Vaughn earlier and it's certainly something that I think the Planning Commission should discuss before breaking up tonight. And I really hope we do get to Vancouver tonight since Laura is here and it's next.

WRISTON: We can certainly hear her testimony tonight.

LEE: But one thing the Planning Commission could consider if we can not wrap everything up on Monday night is to continue the home occupations again on Thursday and continue from Monday to Thursday. I know that's not necessarily a good option, but it's certainly something to keep in mind as a possibility that could occur.

LEIN: Yeah, Dennis.

OSBORN: I think one thing that I, one point I was trying to get across is we will not have as Pat indicated our capital facilities plan done until, a draft done, until April 15th. You may want to ask your legal counsel but I'm not sure how you can adopt and recommend to the County Commissioners to adopt an urban growth boundary and move forward on that without a CFP to show that you can service that area, and I believe there's a recent

Hearings Board case out of Jefferson County that supports that, and that's why we were suggesting the six month extension to, you know, and our preference is to let us move forward under the alternative that you went to the Environmental Impact Statement on and let us do our CFP on that and if we can't pay for it, it doesn't look like it's going to fly, then we have to again, like I said, modify the finance program, the way to pay for it or reassess the land use element which is the requirements of State statute.

And Battle Ground is not going to try and play with the numbers to make it to where we can't, we want an urban growth boundary that we can't serve, we don't want to put ourselves and our future constituents in that, in that position. If we can't fund it, we don't want it. And so I don't know if Mr. Lowry has any comments on what I just said, but that's our recommendation from Battle Ground staff to the County Planning Commission. So thank you.

LEE: Yeah, I think, I don't know if it was last week or the week before, but Rich and I, Rich's legal opinion was, yeah, that makes sense from a legal opinion, from a policy standpoint I'm saying applying the urban holding would be admittedly maybe not the best alternative but certainly a viable alternative in our mind, and it may have some advantages in terms of finally bringing together a capital facilities plan and a land use plan in the most timely manner.

MOSS: Now we'll hear from the other side.

LEE: Remember this from a couple of weeks ago.

LOWRY: Rich Lowry again. There is no question in my mind but that our plan is so deficient in capital facilities planning that we're going to be faced with an automatic remand and potential invalidity.

WRISTON: Well, with this testimony.

LOWRY: We not only don't have capital facilities planning from Battle Ground, we don't have it from any of the other cities, we don't have it for parks, we don't have it for schools, you know, we're deficient under and GMA requires an internally consistent plan, we don't have one.

LEE: From my perspective, and, you know, I'm, and I don't disagree with Rich that we're looking at a likely remand, my opinion is we're looking at a likely remand whether or not we have the 20 year capital facilities or not, why not go ahead, adopt the plan with the 6 year capital facilities strategy as we outlined before, accept a remand if it comes to us and work on the basis of that remand to clean up the capital facilities, reassessing the land use over the next year as opposed to waiting six months to a year, complete a 20 year capital facilities plan, then go to the Hearings Board in six months and get remanded then. I think we're going to be losing a year in the process.

LOWRY: I think that the primary downside to adopting the plan that we know is going to get remanded is that the capital facilities element is supposed to inform where the urban growth boundary is and to adopt urban growth boundaries that we know may have to be changed once we proved them up with capital facilities plans sends in my opinion the wrong message to the folk that are going to be affected and have expectations because of the adoption of the land use plan.

WRISTON: What happens --

LEE: I'm not going to say anymore.

WRISTON: No, Rich has a good point, that actually was the question I was going to -- I mean what happens on the remand? We're doing all this work to go to the Commissioners, they'll adopt it or they won't adopt it, and that's a discussion that we got to, we need to have one of these days on those key issues, towards the end I guess, we have to make a recommendation probably on that.

LEE: You do.

WRISTON: But whether we say adopt or don't adopt, if we adopt and it goes and it gets remanded, then we're going to do a capital facilities plan and then we're going to relook at the urban growth boundaries all over again? I mean we're going to do this again?

LOWRY: Well, Dennis is correct that what the Act says is if you can't support the plan with a capital facilities plan, you have to either find additional sources of funds or reassess the zoning --

WRISTON: Right.

LOWRY: -- designations.

LEE: Or change the level-of-service standards --

LOWRY: Or change the level-of-service standards.

LEE: -- and as part of the strategy that we had outlined we are going to be revisiting concurrency ordinance, we're going to be revisiting the traffic impact fee program next year, that would be within this time frame of the potential remand and I believe it is the most expeditious route to final resolution of the issue.

DELEISSEGUES: It seems to me it's kind of a chicken and an egg process, you can't figure out what the capital investments are going to be needed until you determine where your boundaries are going to be; on the other hand you can't determine where your

boundaries are going to be unless you prove that you have the capital investments to support it. You got to start somewhere and I'd suggest that we go ahead and recommend the staff report on Battle Ground with the addition of the several parcels that we discussed conditioned upon a later agreement between Battle Ground and the County when Battle Ground is able to come up with the numbers that they have for infrastructure and if there's adjustments that have to be made at that time, they can work it out. We could sit here until April and not have any more information, as Jeff pointed out. We either do that tonight or we wait a long time for better information.

LEIN: Dennis.

BARCA: You'd think he'd be sitting closer by now.

OSBORN: Yeah. Well, I've got a legal counsel person over there who's been in my ear.

BARCA: Get him to sit with you.

OSBORN: Pro bono work, right. It's not, I mean this isn't the first county that's faced this problem, and the phrase chicken versus the egg I've heard that before, I think it's pretty clear. The statute tells you you have to have that match. You know, I know Pat commented on having the LOS issue resolved by next year, but you're going to be in remand at that time, so it's not going to get you where you need to be. Again, if you tell the Cities and the County tells the Cities what the boundary is that we can plan for for our capital facilities plan, we'll do the CFP planning, not a problem, then we'll present it back and you'll have those answers, you'll have them. And to me the logic is hold off, you have statutorily until December of 2004 to do this, I don't understand what the rush is. I mean you have a whole other year to actually do that planning versus dealing, and I know there's some chuckling, but you're looking at two years on a remand. Is that, so, you know, six months versus two years.

LEIN: We know how long a remand takes, don't we, Rich.

WRISTON: We're chuckling --

LEIN: Four years.

WRISTON: We're chuckling in that we, some of us, don't understand what the rush is either, that's why. So I think it was a bit of an agreement.

OSBORN: And if it's okay with you I would defer a couple of, a minute of my time to my pro bono legal counsel there if that's okay with the Planning Commission.

LEIN: Can we take a break first, Randy --

PRINTZ: Sure.

LEIN: -- before you start because I know how you get going.

PRINTZ: I really don't have any prepared remarks.

LEE: I'm going to have to rethink some of these site-specific requests that Randy's representing here.

PRINTZ: I have to talk to Pat here before I --

LEIN: Let's take a break.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: We'll bring the meeting back to order. Mr. Printz.

PRINTZ: Out of deference to Pat and everybody I'll be extremely short.

LEIN: Thank you.

PRINTZ: I along with four or five other of my colleagues went to the Board in 1999 to sort of start this process and it is not very typical for the development community to ask for any, to ask for delay, but in this case it's difficult to see any compelling reason to intentionally do this wrong. And I mean I think everybody here is acknowledging that what we're about to do is neither legally correct or from a public policy correct, and my view is that in terms of time and your time, our time, the public's time, if we adopt something about what we're about to adopt and it's automatic remand, we're going to, it's going to take six months to a year to go through that process, we're then going to come back and then we're going to start going through all of this again and why not take whatever time it takes, which hopefully isn't long, and I think there will be a much better chance to keep sort of everyone's feet to the fire if we don't adopt, but to then do the capital facilities, do a plan that is legally sufficient and is from a public policy standpoint defensible and good for the community. There's just there's no reason to have everybody stand around and say we recognize the deficiencies of this, but we're going to do it anyway. I mean that just doesn't make sense.

LEIN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: He's preaching to the choir.

LEIN: I think this will be --

WRISTON: Should we vote on that issue?

LEIN: You want to vote on that issue, yeah. Any other discussion on Battle Ground right now? Okay. I think what we'd like to do, I know this is not going to please Mr. Lee, but I think what we'd like to do is listen to Ms. Hudson in terms of from the City of Vancouver with respect because she can't be here Monday night, but then what that does it leaves the following for Monday, which means we will probably then carry over to Thursday so we should direct staff to move the home occupation hearing from Thursday because in my notes I think we still have to finalize the capital facilities plan, we still need to listen to La Center, Ridgefield, Battle Ground and Vancouver, we need to deal with the no net loss policy and urban holding policy, plus other things as it comes along.

LEE: Could I, there's actually two items scheduled for Thursday, the home occupations and then the concurrency. Would it be okay to go ahead with that concurrency? I believe that's a very short item.

LEIN: Yeah, I think so. Yeah.

LEE: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Is that agreeable with everybody how to conclude this evening?

MOSS: Yes.

LEIN: Ron, do you want to continue the hearing?

BARCA: I'd just like to get the home occupation thing done personally. I think we've put that group of constituents off repeatedly already as well. I think we could actually do that one. This one whether we have Thursday available or not is somewhat inconsequential to finale, but we're getting closer. So I will bend to the will of the majority, but I haven't heard anybody else besides Lonnie say anything.

SMITH: I'd rather do the home occupation on Thursday and get it out of the way.

DELEISSEGUES: Me too.

SMITH: Give some of these other folks a little bit more time.

DELEISSEGUES: I would too.

RUPLEY: I would too.

LOWRY: If it would have any bearing on this issue, I have a need to be in Seattle next Friday morning and so may not be able to make your Thursday evening meeting and I think it's probably critical for me to be at your meeting to discuss home occupations. I don't

think it critical for me to be at your wrap-up meeting on comp plan.

WRISTON: Wrap-up. You guys don't stop.

LEE: Never. Never until it's done.

MOSS: I'd rather have Rich here.

BARCA: So, Rich, when are you saying that you're available to help us finish our home occupation ordinance then?

LOWRY: Probably on any other Thursday.

BARCA: Any other Thursday.

LEIN: How about Thanksgiving, are you doing anything then? Because then we could start getting into the 4th, the 11th --

WRISTON: Of December?

LEIN: -- the 18th of December.

MOSS: What's the matter with the 25th?

LEIN: Yeah, then we've got the 25th. Mr. Lee.

LEE: It's really the -- I mean I would, my personal preference would be to continue the home occupations and wrap up the comp plan and when you reschedule the home occupations would largely be when you're able to get a quorum. I think staff would be available any of those dates that you suggested, December 4th, the 11th, 18th. 18th is your regular meeting.

LEIN: Correct. We don't have anything on the agenda that evening I don't think yet, do we?

BARCA: The comp plan.

LEIN: Okay. But we need to probably set a date certain tonight to be able to move the home occ; right?

LEE: Yes, because we'd want to notify.

LEIN: Do you want to just move it to the 18th of December or do you want to have early hearings in December?

RUPLEY: I'm not available on the 4th but I can do anything else.

MOSS: Boy, I don't know, that's kind of dicey. Are we going to have a quorum here on the 18th?

LEIN: I'll be here. Anybody else?

WRISTON: Me too.

LEIN: On the 18th.

DELEISSEGUES: I'll be here.

RUPLEY: I'm here.

SMITH: I'm here.

LEIN: We'll have a quorum. Okay. So we'll move home occ to the 18th.

DELEISSEGUES: December 18th?

LEIN: Yes. Do you know where it's at?

WISER: The Board of Commissioners' Hearing Room.

LEIN: Okay. It will be at the Board of County Commissioners' Hearing Room, 6:30. Okay, Laura, please.

HUDSON: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Vaughn, do you know if we'll have a workshop?

LEIN: I don't think we'll have a workshop that night, will we?

LEE: On the 18th?

LEIN: Yeah.

HUDSON: You might still be doing this.

BARCA: Well, why not.

LEE: No. No.

LEIN: No.

HUDSON: Thank you for making time for me this evening, I won't be available on Monday and we have several other commitments that night and I did want to express the dismay that the City Council felt when we were given information about the proposed changes to the Vancouver urban growth area. We understand that they result from staff's attempt to solve the road problem on the north/south arterials between Battle Ground and Vancouver, but we think it's the wrong way to go about it. It's the wrong way both in terms of the process because this was dumped on us at the last minute after the close of public testimony and with limited opportunity to evaluate the impact, and it's the wrong way in terms of what's happening to the Vancouver urban growth area.

The City asked for a two and a half mile expansion to the urban growth boundary that would be mostly to the east of the city and would be mostly for employment, mostly for jobs. Because we had figured that we could with under the existing zoning in the existing UGA accommodate 95,334 additional people or about 30,000 households and about 59,311 jobs, more households than jobs, we want more jobs, we agree with the County Commissioners' direction to emphasize employment. What is being proposed now is three times that. It's almost eight square miles of Vancouver urban growth area. A lot of it is in an area we didn't ask for, we ask that that area be continued in urban reserve or expanded urban reserve and the proposed land use changes would give us 1,000 acres of additional residential land which is not where we need to grow. We need to grow in jobs, not in housing. So we are urging you not to do that for the, to Vancouver, to the Vancouver urban growth area.

And we have a couple of suggestions for ways that you can avoid expanding the urban growth area. They are things I've said before, I know I'm going to sound like a broken record. One of them is that you don't need to plan for as large of growth target as you've got. You're now higher than the median and you're planning for more growth over the next 20 years than we accommodated over the last 20 years. If you stick to the median, you take care of most of the population that you've taken out of Battle Ground and you don't have to shove them into the Vancouver urban growth area. If you reduce the market factor, you don't have a market factor for residential now, if you don't, you don't need one for commercial or industrial, you already have a 100 percent market factor in that you've got 20 years of land supply for a plan that you know you'll have to redo in 10 years. If you reduce that, then you reduce the amount of land that you have to plan capital facilities for, you can make your plan expansions into the urban reserve area, which most of the service providers, all of the service providers that I've talked to, have looked at that urban reserve, figured it would be urban eventually and their capital facilities plans incorporate it. You've gone outside of that area.

Also, your assumptions don't include much of a factor for redevelopment of existing land, but I think you probably remember the map I held the first time I testified about Evergreen

Airport showing is built but we've got a proposal to redevelop it, about the Gateway not showing as land, about how little of the development was shown as possible in the downtown area and how much we know has been proposed there. And we're also working on the Section 30 plan now and that's an area that shows as built but has a large potential for growth in the future.

We're asking that you give us time to help work through this. If you can't give us time, if you feel that you're under extreme pressure to continue, change the assumptions and make the growth something that you can fit within an area that has capital facilities planning done for it, that's either the existing urban growth area or only into urban reserves and change the assumptions so that you don't need to take in land you can't match with the planning. Thank you for listening to me again on this topic and I'm sorry I won't be here next Monday to answer questions. I'll try to have someone here to answer site-specific questions for the Planning Commission.

LEIN: Thank you, Laura. Any questions of Ms. Hudson?

SMITH: Oh, you know, I still have heartache over the eastern portion of that part that you would like to have on 162nd where this area is literally under two to three feet of water for several months of the year, I don't understand how it could be valuable as urban growth, the lowest tax lot in that area is an open space set up through a cluster subdivision. I mean what point is there to bring that kind of property into the urban growth? It's designated in the comp plan as floodplain, as open space, conservation greenway, Tier I, Critical 1 and 2 lands, fish and wildlife conservation area, priority species, why would that be interesting to you to bring into the urban growth boundary?

HUDSON: It's designated as all those things and we agree that it's a valuable environmental resource and we show it actually on our plan map as being one of the open space greenways that should boundary be recognized in the planning effort, but it's also true that several of those property owners out there have asked to be included in the urban growth area. That right across 162nd from it is the Birtcher property, is an area that's developing that it will have infrastructure available to it and that it's --

SMITH: Well, I know the landowner on the lowest portion hasn't asked for it, and I know Ron Andersen hasn't and he has probably 70 percent of the area you're talking about, I can't, maybe it was the Thompson brothers, but they own, which makes sense on their land that borders 500, but not necessarily the land that's back behind that that's all wetland. Well, we'll discuss it next week I guess.

HUDSON: Yeah, that came, that request came in before I got to the City so I don't know all the history about it and I'll try to have the people here that were a party to that next week.

SMITH: That would be great.

WRISTON: I think the requirements are going to be to a lot of that remain open though that --

SMITH: It would be open space but it's also open space where the County, you know, Bill Dygert has identified it through that the bonded conservation greenspace deal and they'd like to make a walkway eventually just like we have at Salmon Creek and if it's split between County and City that might complicate that, it may complicate the funding for that. I don't know, maybe not.

WRISTON: We should find out maybe before --

RUPLEY: It is part of the Conservation Futures.

WRISTON: But we ought to find out if this would complicate that because otherwise I think the idea is to preserve it as open space. I mean it may serve to protect it.

SMITH: So you would never necessarily -- you wouldn't necessarily bring it into the city.

HUDSON: The advantage of having it part of the city or part of the urban growth area is it gives us the opportunity to work with using it as an enhancement area for some of the lower quality wetlands that are also a part of that system that could be developed, offer some opportunity there. That's at least what I've been told, so one of the, one of the pieces of logic that went into requesting that.

SMITH: Okay. Bringing it into the city would you'd lose some of the traditional uses you've had to have in there.

HUDSON: It wouldn't be a dairy anymore if it came into the city.

SMITH: I think if Ron lives to 100 it will be a dairy for another 40 years.

WRISTON: It's, you know, that urban holding language, there's a sentence in there that specifically says about the open, maybe add some stuff to that or something to, but it says, you know --

SMITH: Open space corridors will be maintained between urban areas.

WRISTON: Right. It's vague, I put that that's vague, but, you know, maybe we need to be a little more specific on that but --

LEIN: Mr. Lee.

LEE: I put up, you know, well, I didn't put up, Evan put up, this is the area that I think

Carey was inquiring about, and as you can see there is a significant number of property owner requests in that area.

SMITH: And those are all on the west side which is high and dry.

WRISTON: Right. So that's --

SMITH: Although two of the requests that are just below that, those two lands are one's for a church or something or education center and those will be under water too, they'll have to fill those wetlands to make those happen.

WRISTON: Well, maybe the areas need to be --

LEE: There is a request up in --

WRISTON: Maybe a delineation needs to be done or something like that before the open space area is decided or something. We could maybe look at that language and talk to Dygert.

SMITH: That's right maybe.

WRISTON: But that language would serve to protect it more than it is today.

LEIN: Any other questions of Ms. Hudson? Thank you. Rich.

LOWRY: Just to answer one of the questions, the funding options that are being looked at for the conservation acquisitions go across jurisdictional boundaries, so the plan that Bill Dygert has put together would be -- there is proposed to be funded by a countywide tax that could be expended in both cities and the unincorporated area.

SMITH: So we can spend the County's money on City property, okay.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

LEE: You don't want to go through the rest of the Vancouver maps while you're on a roll here?

LEIN: I'm afraid we would be doing disservice to Vancouver.

WRISTON: I missed the roll part.

LEE: I'm sorry. You got through Yacolt, Washougal and Camas pretty well.

MOSS: We made progress tonight, Pat.

LEE: We did make progress. We did.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp

Vaughn Lein, Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

SWmin 11-13-03